BACONIANA

VOL. VI. *Third Series.* APRIL, 1908. No. 22.

BY the kindness of Messrs. Ellis and Elvey, of New Bond Street, we are allowed to publish a facsimile and transcription of an interesting personal document relating to Francis Bacon. It is an agreement by which the rent of an inn at Chelmsford (formerly the property of Benedict Barnham, a Sheriff of London) was to be divided between his four daughters and their husbands. The second daughter (Alice) became in 1606 the wife of Sir Francis Bacon.

TRANSCRIPTION.

. . . emorund[um] this Indented wryting witnesseth. Whereas the Messuage and Inn called the Fawkon in Chelmisford in the county of Essex late Benedict Barnham's esqr deceased is assigned to the right hoble Francis Lo: Verolam Lo: Chauncellor of England and to the Lady Alice Verolam his wife for such estate and otherwise in such sorte as by Indentrs in that behalf apeareth Nevertheles charged and chargeable to paie yearly one yearly rent of Sixtene pounde[s] by the yeare for equallity of p[ar]tition unto Sr John Constable and Dame Dorothy his wife for such estate and estates as by Certeine quinquep[ar]tite Indentrs of the date hereof apeareth. That now it is agreed by the p[ar]ties whose names are subscribed hereunto That if the said Messuage and Inn now bee or hereafter upon the expiration of the lease whereby the same is now Inioyed by the Tenante therefore shalbe of any better or more Yearly value then Sixtene pounde by the yeare. That then the said overplus of the said yearly value over and above Sixteene po[u]ndes p[er] Ann[um] is to be equally and ratably devided

emongest the said p[ar]ties (that is to saie) One fourth p[ar]te therof to the said Lo: Chauncellor and Lady Verolam for such estate as the said Messuage and Inn is to them and otherwise by their direction lymitted. And one other fourth parte therof to the Earle of Castlehaven and the Countesse his now wife for such estate as their p[ar]te of the Lands late the said Benedictes is to them limitted. And one other fourth p[ar]te of the said overplus to the said Sr John Constable and Dame Dorothie his wife for such estate as they have in their parte of the Landes late the said Benedictes. And one other fourth p[ar]te to Sr William Soame and Dame Bridgett his wife for such estate as they have in their part of the Lande late the said Benedictes. And if the said Messuage and Inn now be not nor upon the expiration of the said Lease thereof shalbe of the cleere yearly value of Sixteene Pounde by the yeare wherby to answere the said yearly Rente of Sixtene pounde yearly to the said Sr John Constable and his wife as aforesaid That then it is alsoe agreed by the said p[ar]ties That soe much only shalbe paid out of the said Inn as the same is reasonably worth, And that all such want and defect of value shalbe yearly ratably and p[ro]portionably paid by the said Lo: Chauncellor and Lady Verolam The Earle of Castlehaven and Countesse his wife and Sr William Soame and Dame Bridgett his wife and the heires of the said Lady Verolam of the said Countesse and of the said Dame Bridgett Soame unto the said Sr John Constable and Dame Dorothy his wife and the heires of the said Dame Dorothy. And as for the yearly value of the said Messuage and Inn, It is agreed that Allen and Tite the Surveyors who made the p[ar]tition of the said landes shall determyne therof.

In Wytnes wherof the said Lord Verolam Lo: Chauncellor of England and Lady Alice Verolam his wife the said Mervyn Lo: Andelay Earle of Castlehaven and Elizabeth Countesse of Castlehaven his wife Sr John Constable Kt. and Dame Dorothy his wife Sr William Soame Dame Bridget his wife have herunto subscribed their names the first day of May in the yeares of the raigne of our Soveraigne Lord James by the grace of god King of England Fraunce and Ireland defender of the faith &c the Eighteenth and of Scotland the three and fifteth

Fr. Verulam Canc	Castlehaven
Alice Verulam	Eliza: Castlehaven
Jo: Constable	W. Soame
Dorothy Constable	Bridget Soame

THE JEW OF MALTA

By Rev. Walter Begley.

THE results of the most advanced and latest criticisms on this play are,—

1. That it was written shortly after 1589: on account of the remark in the introduction before Act I., "Now the Guize is dead." The Duc de Guise was murdered December 23rd, 1588.

2. The first notice of its being played is of the date 26th February, 1592, when Henslowe's Diary records it as having brought in 5os.

3. It was entered in Stationers' Register on 17th May, 1594, but no proof exists that it was ever printed. Anyhow, no copies are recorded anywhere. Not till forty years later (1633) do we find it in print, when it was published by Thomas Heywood, the well-known dramatist, a contemporary of Marlowe.

4. The Jew of Malta (Barabas) is the prototype of the Jew of Venice (Shylock), and there is a closer connection of plot and character between the two Jews than was formerly noticed. Professor A. W. Ward says,—"In both Shakespeare's and Marlowe's plays the view inculcated is that, on the part of a Jew, fraud is the sign of his tribe, whereas on the part of Christians, counter-fraud, though accompanied by violence, is worthy of commendation. This I cannot but regard as the primary effect of the whole of either play."

There are several things in *The Jew of Malta* which seem to point to the author of the Shakespeare plays. There is an odd passage in Act IV. scene i., where Ithamore, having, in conjunction with the Jew, Barabas, strangled Friar Barnardine, suggests that his corpse should not be left lying on the ground, but should be set up in a natural position. He does this on the stage, and then says to the Jew, his master,

"So, let him lean upon his staff; excellent, he stands as if he were begging of Bacon." This passage would not suggest much were it not that Bacon is spelled with a capital B. This, conjoined with the singular way in which the word Bacon is introduced, apparently *a propos* of nothing, certainly renders it suspicious, and possibly cryptogrammatic.*

Another passage worth noticing comes two scenes later (Act IV., scene iv.), where Ithamore asks Bellamira to

> " . . . sail from hence to Greece, to lovely Greece,
> I'll be thy Jason, thou my golden Fleece;
> Where painted Carpets o're the meads are hurled,
> And Bacchus' vineyards over-spread the world;
> Where Woods and Forrests go in goodly green—
> I'll be Adonis, thou shalt be Love's Queen.
> The Meads, the Orchards, and the Primrose lanes,
> Instead of Sedge and Reeds bear sugar-canes:
> Thou in those Groves, by Dis above,
> Shalt live with me and be my love."

Now, this last line is the famous refrain of the still more famous *Passionate Shepherd*, which was first given to the world in a piratical publication by Jaggard in 1599, and was there attributed to Shakespeare. In the very next year (1600) it was included in that fine selection entitled *England's Helicon*, which evidently proceeded from Francis Bacon, helped by his brother Anthony, with the possible collaboration of Nicholas Ling and others. Now, here it was given to Christopher Marlow, and two new stanzas were added—the fourth and sixth—although Marlowe had been dead seven years. This has a strange appearance, and we are at once inclined to ask, Why did not Francis and Anthony

* *Cf.* Tit. Andronicus, V. i. 135, where the Jew, Aaron, says,—

> "Oft have I digged up dead men from their graves
> And set them upright at their dear friends' doors."

Bacon (assuming their connection with *England's Helicon*) give it to Shakespeare as Jaggard had so recently done? A possible answer seems to be that dead men tell no tales, and Marlowe's name at the end was much safer than Shakespeare's. We cannot exactly tell now how it was that Jaggard attributed this lyric and the rest of his piratical publication to Shakespeare. Perhaps he knew the stolen MS. came from a well-known scriptorium. But on the assumption of the Baconian authorship we can see how necessary it was that Jaggard's ascription of this popular lyric to Shakespeare should be annulled at the first opportunity.

Why? People would be saying that if Shakespeare was really the man who wrote *Come live with me and be my love*, then he was also, "by Dis above," the very man who wrote *The Jew of Malta*, with the well-known refrain, as long ago as 1589, perhaps, for they would have heard it on the stage as early as 1592; and it would also follow that Shakespeare was the author of the atheistical *Dr. Faustus* and other rather dangerous stage-plays, for which Marlowe was supposed to have sufficiently expiated by his untimely death. On this view there was every reason for the Bacons to assign the lyric to Marlowe, whether it were his or not.

Again, the affectionate relations between Barabas, the Jew, and his daughter, Abigail, remind us in many ways of Shylock and Jessica, and both may well have been suggested to Bacon from his frequent opportunities of acquaintance with Dr. Lopez, the Court physician, and some of his family, who were all daughters. Lopez had no son, and neither Barabas nor Shylock has a son brought into notice anywhere in the plays. Again, Barabas often speaks a kind of Judæo-Spanish lingo, and this piece of personal colour is much more likely to be put on him by Bacon, who must have had

frequent talks with Lopez, than by Marlowe, who had never any chance of meeting him.

There are also two lines in *The Jew of Malta* which remind me strongly of *Romeo and Juliet*, both in the circumstances they are uttered and in the words themselves.

Barabas comes in the darkness of night to visit his former house, where Abigail is immured as a nun, and to receive from her, if possible, his concealed bags of gold. After groping about he catches sight, as he thinks, of her at a high window, and thus soliloquises :

> " But stay, what star shines yonder in the east ?
> The loadstar of my life, if Abigail."
>
> —Act II. scene i. 40.

Who does not remember the soliloquy of Romeo when he catches sight of his dearest treasure in a similar way ?

> " But soft ! what light through yonder window breaks ?
> It is the East, and Julia is the Sun."

Shylock, the Jew, in *The Merchant of Venice*, was traced back to Dr. Lopez as long ago as February, 1880, in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, and a great deal of ingenious supposition was brought forward to show that Shakespeare, who was well acquainted with Southampton, and probably also with Essex, "in their company . . . may not unfrequently have met the Doctor," and, again, we hear that Shakespeare hit off the typical characteristics of a Jew to the very life, and "probably from Lopez." This is Mr. Sidney Lee's theory as long ago as twenty-three years. He thinks Lopez, and his trial and fate, the models in the mind of the dramatist for several reasons. The name Antonio is suggestive, being a common Portuguese name, and, through Don Antonio, Lopez was brought to justice. Moreover, Shylock on the stage—or, rather, Burbage—

wore a peculiar kind of beard, which seems to have been an imitation of the beard of Dr. Lopez, for there is a portrait of the doctor in *A Thankfull Remembrance of God's Mercy*, published by Carleton, Bishop of Chichester, in 1627, where this same peculiar beard of Shylock is very noticeable.

Lopez moved in the highest Court circles on account of his reputation as a physician. He was no quack, and whether he was born in England or not, he belonged, at a comparatively early age, to the recently formed College of Physicians, having gained the rudiments of his profession in Italy. In 1575 he appears very high up in the list of the chief doctors in London quoted in Stow. He was married to a Jewess who had relations at Antwerp, and he was the father of a large family of daughters.

He had patients among the principal members of the aristocracy, but was for a long time specially attached to the household of Lord Leicester, who, as is well known, often had actors sent for to Kenilworth to amuse the guests there, and finally had a special licence for a company to be called "the Earl of Leicester's company of servants and players."

In 1586 he was appointed physician to Queen Elizabeth, and it appears from Walsingham's *Journal* (p. 12), and from various notices in the *State Papers*, that he was well acquainted with Sir Francis Walsingham and Lord Burghley, and often introduced his friends and kinsmen from abroad to the Lord Treasurer and Sir Robert Cecil. About the year 1588 there came to England a certain Don Antonio, as he was called, who had been a claimant, through illegitimate descent, to the crown of Portugal when the last king died. He had raised some supporters, and would, no doubt, have become king if Philip of Spain had not chased him out of the country. He first went to France, and coming

to England about the time of the Armada, he was received by the English people with great favour as one who had been unjustly treated by Philip. Don Antonio could only speak Portuguese, so that he required an interpreter, and through Essex, who had taken up the Don's cause very enthusiastically, the Queen asked Lopez to assist his communications, both in speech and writing. And thus, as Shakespeare knew Southampton, the great friend of Essex, very well, according to Mr. Sidney Lee, how very likely that he would also know Lopez and the peculiar character of his speech and manner.

Such ingenious Shakespearian inferences and arguments are, indeed, not up-to-date now. There is little room for Shakespeare's intimacy with Lopez and Southampton and Essex, whereas we know assuredly that Francis Bacon was closely intimate with two of them, and brought much in contact, at Court and elsewhere, with the Queen's physician. Indeed, Dr. Lopez was a man whose company Francis Bacon would be likely to seek for many reasons—intellectual and otherwise. I have a lurking suspicion that Essex, with the help of the Bacons, brought some rather Machiavellian policy into play against Lopez, the evidence of whose guilt does not seem to me sufficiently clear—but that is another tale. Essex was the one who persistently hurried Lopez to the gallows, and first found evidence against him. Possibly Lopez knew too much about Essex and his numerous intrigues with the maids of honour. We are told "Lopez made some very lewd suggestions" against someone who is not named in Bishop Carleton's account.*

Shylock's love for his daughter and his wife, Leah, well agree with the character of Lopez as we know it from the *State Papers*. Lopez was absent from Court,

* *Cf.* Carleton, *A Thankfull Remembrance*, p. 171.

and it turned out to be because the illness of his wife kept him at home, like a devoted husband. The family correspondence between England and Holland also shows that great domestic felicity which is so often noticeable among the well-to-do Jews and Jewesses. But again and again we seem to have Lopez's famous trial and death by hanging aimed at in Shakespeare's Shylock. For instance, the Jew of Venice is described as being infused with the spirit of a wolf lately hanged on the gallows for human slaughter, and his name is so frequently brought into connection with a "halter" that a reference seems implied to some event enacted at Tyburn, in which a Jew was concerned. The references in the play are *Merchant of Venice*, Act IV. scene i. 132, *et seq.* :—

> " . . . thy currish spirit
> Govern'd a wolf, who, hang'd for human slaughter,
> Even from the gallows did his fell soul fleet,
> And . . . infused itself in thee."

I wonder Mr. Lee, who noticed this reference so long ago, did not also notice that the personal name, *Lopez*, is equivalent to *Wolf*, for, looked at thus, the indication is much more telling—nay, almost certain—and very Baconian as well. The "halter" references in *The Merchant of Venice* are Act II. scene ii. 97 ; Act IV. scene i. 361, etc.

We know, as an historical fact, that Bacon and Essex were much brought into contact with Dr. Lopez, and the probability is that Bacon, with his numerous Court connections, had known the Court doctor for some years. How much more likely, then, that Bacon should write the two Jew plays than Marlowe or Shakespeare, who could have little or nothing to connect them with Lopez.

Shakespeare has in *Hamlet* (Q.): "With juyce of Hebona in a viall." Marlowe, in *The Jew of Malta*,

has: "The Juice of Hebon." This same Hebon, or Hebona, or Hebenon (F.), was a tremendous puzzler to the orthodox critics until Rev. W. A. Harrison read a most exhaustive paper (26 pp.) to show that the poison of the yew tree is meant. He proved his point out of most learned and rare books by an "array of authorities." He concluded his address by thus answering a supposed objector who might say, "I quite accept all you have so learnedly brought forward about the effects of yew poison; but where is your proof that Shakespeare knew all this?" To this the reverend lecturer answered, "I do not think it is incumbent upon me to furnish such proof. . . . I might retort that the burden of proof rests with those who assume that Shakespeare did not know it." This is an excellent specimen of the orthodox method.

The most colossal figures to be met with in the early Elizabethan drama are Tamburlaine, Faustus, and Barabas. There can be very little doubt that the author of these high-reaching models had studied Machiavelli very thoroughly. One has only to glance through what those excellent German critics Brandt and Edward Meyer say about the influence of the "Principe" on the Elizabethan drama generally to freely admit this. Now, since we know that Francis Bacon and his brother Anthony—and, indeed, all their chief friends and relations—were intensely interested in matters of State policy, we can, I think, safely say that Bacon was a likely author of these wonderful productions.

In corroboration let us hear what is said about the study of Machiavelli in France in 1577, the very time young Francis Bacon was crossing the Channel to spend a year or two of his life in that country.

It is an Englishman—one Simon Patericke—who makes the following remarks to the young men, Francis

Hastings and Edward Bacon (a half-brother of Francis through his father's first marriage), in the epistle dedicatory of a book addressed to him,—

"Moreover, Satan useth strangers of France as his fittest instruments, to infect us stil with this deadly poyson sent out of Italie, who have so highly promoted their Machivellian bookes, that he is of no reputation in the Court of France, which hath not *Machiavel's* writings at the fingers' ends, and that book in the Italian and French tongues, and can apply his precepts to all purposes, as the oracles of Apollo."

Here was a school, indeed, for the author of *The Jew of Malta*. Did Marlowe ever have such a chance? Nay, do we not seem to hear Bacon's voice and Bacon's experience at the French Court in the opening lines of the famous *Tragedy of the Rich Jew of Malta*,—

"Albeit the world think Machiavel is dead,
Yet was his soul but flown beyond the Alps;
And now the Guise is dead, is come from France,
To view this land and frolic with his friends."

Anyhow, the author, in this prologue, thought Machiavelli had come to England from France, and Marlowe could not have imagined this half so well as Bacon, for Marlowe had little, if any, experience of the courtly life or courtly sentiments of France.

But it must not be forgotten that Marlowe had the reputation of having imbibed Machiaveli's principles, and was strictly and solemly warned to give them up by Greene when leaving the world, and speaking from a bed of sorrow and repentance, and possibly the play *Macchiavelli*, now lost, *was* by Marlowe.

The external evidence for attributing the authorship of *The Jew of Malta* to Marlowe is very small. It depends on Thos. Heywood *only*, and his evidence, as is quite well known, is open to suspicion. If anyone will take the trouble to read Heywood's statement in the vestibule of the Jew of Malta when he intro-

duced it to the public after Bacon's death, it will, I think, be found unsatisfactory. But the *external* evidence for all the Marlowe plays is from many reasons so very weak that we are reduced, broadly speaking, to internal evidence only.

Finally, looking back at Tamburlaine, Faustus, and the Jew of Malta as a great connected and consecutive trilogy, we get additional evidence of an intuitional kind which tends to lead us to Francis Bacon rather than poor Kit Marlowe. We have in each case a one character drama, and the one character is a personification of a single great ruling passion.

Tamburlaine represents the lust for personal rule and dominion.

Faustus stands for the overwhelming desire for boundless knowledge.

Barabas, in *The Jew of Malta*, is the very personification of the fierce hunger for gold.

Now, each and all of these were at work in Francis Bacon's own personality in a higher degree, perhaps, than in any other man of that time, especially the first and second, as everyone knows, and as to gold, Bacon said, "Money was power first of all."

NOTE.

The Jew of Malta contains a large number of Shakespearean echoes, besides those referred to by Mr. Begley, and the style, the lyric beauty, the lavish wealth of knowledge and imagination, if they point to any author distinctively, certainly point to Bacon. Such parallels as the following are characteristically Shakespearean, whether they are found elsewhere or not:—

> "Proteus for shapes, and Roscius for a tongue,
> So could he speak—so vary."—*Prologue.*

Proteus, both as a proper name and as a symbolic

name, is constantly repeated in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, and it occurs in 3 *Henry VI.* III. ii. 192.

Roscius is also in 3 *Henry VI.* V. vi. 10; also in *Hamlet* II. ii. 387.

Pygmalion is in the epilogue and in *Measure for Measure* III. ii. 42.

Swelling, produced by ambition, is remarkably Baconian and Shakespearean (see my "Shakespeare Studies," p. 238-9, 440, 453.)

This is repeated in Act IV. i. 6 in reference to poison.

Machiavelli, in his prologue, says, "There is no sin but ignorance." So do the Clown and Malvolio in *Twelfth Night* IV. iii. 41—45, and Lord Say in 2 *Henry VI.* IV. vii. 69.

Marlowe, Bacon, and Shakespeare all speak of money as *trash* (see I. i. 7, and "Shakespeare Studies," p. 271).

I can not tell—a particularly Baconian phrase—occurs also in I. i. 21st speech, and see "Shakespeare Studies," Chap. IV.

Barabas says :—

> "Things past recovery
> Are hardly cured with exclamations.
> Be silent, daughter, sufferance needs ease.
> —I. ii. 75th speech.

This is plentifully echoed in Shakespeare (see *Promus* 945, 951; also *Coriolanus* I. i. 20, and the *Promus* references.

A *reaching thought*, I. ii. 73rd speech, recalls the *reaching hand* of which Lord Say speaks (2 *Henry VI.* IV. vii. 76).

The word *exclaims*, as a noun, is in I. ii. 74th speech; also in *Richard II.* I. ii. 2, *Richard III.* I. ii. 52; IV. iv. 135.

Entreat 'em fair, I. i. 89th speech, is frequent in Marlowe and Shakespeare (see "Shakespeare Studies," p. 450).

Swift-footed time, II. i. 7, recalls swift course of time, *Two Gentlemen of Verona* I. iii. 23; swift foot of time, *As You Like It*, III. ii. 288, etc.

The raven and lark are coupled in II. ii. last speech, and in *Titus Andronicus* II. iii. 149; III. i. 158.

The Jew who says we

> "Can fawn like spaniels when we please,
> And when we grin we bite" (II. ii. speech 18)

is clearly echoed in

> "Look, when he fawns he bites."
> —*Richard III.* I. iii. 290.

The serpent and the dove are both frequent in the two groups of writings.

When we read—

> "What sparkle does it give without a firl?
> The diamond that I talk of ne'er was piled."
> —II. ii. speech 29.

recalls *Promus* 89 with its large collection of parallels which, indeed, do not nearly exhaust the collection that might be made, both from Bacon and Shakespeare.

In Act V. scene ii. we find the familiar Baconian and Shakespearean echo, "Occasion's bald behind: slip not thine opportunity" (see *Promus*, 166, 856; "Bacon's Life," VII. 179; and "Essay of Delays").

Our critics are very fond of depreciating the significance of parallels or denying the reality of any pair if they are not textually identical. Whatever deductions, however, may be made from their import when *we* use them—(they are always highly important and convincing when *they* themselves use them)—at least we may assuredly claim that when there are a goodly number it proves that the two (supposed) writers possessed a good deal of the same mental furniture, and used it in a remarkably similar way. We are con-

tent that readers of ordinarily good sense shall determine the point at which similarity becomes identity. Some such point certainly exists, and if we *strain* our evidence perhaps our critics *dis-strain* it.

R. M. Theobald.

LETTER BY SIR THOMAS BODLEY

THE following letter written by Sir Thomas Bodley, from Fulham, to Sir Francis Bacon, is No. ccxxxiii. in the Reliquiæ Bodleiana. Spedding makes a passing reference to it in Vol. III. of the Life and Letters, page 365, for the purpose of fixing the date of a letter written by Bacon to Bodley. The *Cogitata et Visa* was published for the first time in 1653 by Grüter in Latin. It will be remembered that Mr. Edwin Reed in his *Francis Bacon, our Shakespeare*, draws attention to the remarkable discrepancies which exist between the text as published by Grüter and a manuscript copy of the *Cogitata* found about 1857 in the library of Queen's College, Oxford. This manuscript was undoubtedly genuine as there were on it corrections in Bacon's own handwriting. It contains reference to certain *Tabulæ Inveniendi*, which Bacon contemplated publishing, and which were to form the fourth part of his Instauratio Magna. Spedding says, "of the fourth part not even any fragment has come down to us." The whole of these references are omitted from the text published by Isaac Grüter. A full and most interesting account of these omissions will be found in the chapter in *Bacon's System of Philosophy* in Mr. Edwin Reed's work before referred to.

This letter contains that remarkable passage to which

the late Mr. G. C. Bompas drew attention in his *Problem of the Shakespeare Plays*, the great significance of which has perhaps not been sufficiently insisted upon by Baconians: "Which course (*i.e.*, diving yet deeper as it were into the bowels and secrets of nature) would to God (to whisper so much in your ears) you had followed at first, when you fell to the study of such a a thing as was not worthy of such a student." The words *to whisper so much in your ear* appear to suggest that the unworthy study, whatever it may have been, was considered a secret.

What a change has taken place in Bodley's attitude towards Bacon between the two letters. In the first he lectures the young man from a higher vantage ground, whilst in the second he has become deferential in his style of address.

A Letter from Sir Thomas Bodley to Sir Francis Bacon, Fulham, London, February 19th, 1607.

Sir

As soon as Term was ended, supposing your leisure to be more than before, I was coming to thank you two or three times, rather chusing to do it by Word than Letter, but was still disappointed of my purpose, as I am at this present upon an urgent occasion, which doth tie me fast to *Fulham*, and hath made me now determine to impart my Mind by writing. I think you know I have read your "*Cogitata & Visa*," which I have done with great Desire, reputing it to be a Token of your singular Love, that you joyned me with those of your chiefest Friends, to whom you would commend the first Perusal of your Draught; For which I pray you give me leave to say this; first, that if the depth of my Affection to your Person and Spirit, and to your Work and Words, and to all your abilities, were as highly to be valued, as your affection is to me, it might walk with your's arm in arm, and claim your Love by just Desert: But there can be no comparison, where our States are so uneven, and our means to demonstrate our Affections so different; in so much as for my own, I must leave it to be prised in the Nature that it is, and you shall find it evermore addicted to your worth.

As touching the subject of your book, you have set on foot so many rare and noble Speculations, as I cannot chuse but wonder (and shall wonder at it ever) that your Expence of time, considered in your Publick Profession, which hath in a manner no acquaintance with any Scholarship or Learning, you should have called out the Quintessence, and sucked up the Sap of the chiefest kinds of Learning: For howsoever in some Points you vary altogether from that which, and hath been ever the received Doctrine of the Schools; and was always by the wisest (as still they are deemed) of all Nations and Ages adjudged the truest; yet it is apparent, that in these very points, and in all your Proposals and Plots in that Book, you show your self a Master Workman. For my self, I must confess, and do speak it *Ingenue*, that for Matter of Learning, I am not worthy to be reckoned among smatterers. Howbeit, sith it may seem, that being willing to communicate this Treatise to your Friends, you are likewise willing to listen to whatsoever they can except against it: I must deliver unto you that for my Private Opinion, I am one of that *Crew* that say there is, and we possess a far greater Holdfast of Certainty in the Sciences, than you by your Discourse will seem to acknowledge—For where at first you do object the ill Success and Errors of Practitioners of Physick; you know as well they proceed of the Patients Unruliness (*for not one Man in an hundred does obey his Physician* in observing *his Counsels*) or by Mis-Information of their own Indisposition (for few are able in that kind to explicate themselves) or by Reason their Diseases are by Nature incurable, which is incident you know, to many Maladies; or from some other hidden cause, cannot be discovered by Course of Conjecture. Howbeit, I am full of this Belief, That as Physick is ministred Now a Days by Physicians, it is much to be ascribed to their Negligence or Ignorance, or other Touch of Imperfection, that they speed not better in their Practice; for few are found of that profession so well instructed in their Art, as they might be by the Precepts which their Art affordeth; which if it be defective in regard of full Perfection, yet certainly it doth flourish with admirable remedies, such as Tract of Time hath taught, by experimental Events, and are the high way to that principal Knowledge which you recommend. As for *Alchemy* and *Magick*, some conclusions they have worth the preserving, but all their Skill is so accompanied with subtleties and Guils, as both the Crafts and Crafts-Masters are

not only despised, but named with Derision: Whereupon to make good your principal Assertion, Methinks you should have drawn the most of your Examples from that which is taught in the Liberal Sciences, not by pecking out cases that happen very seldom, and may by all Confession be subject to reproof; but by controuling the Generals and Grounds, and invent Positions and Aphorisms, which with greatest Artists and Philosophers have from time to time defended: For it goeth currant amongst all Men of Learning, that those kinds of Arts which Clarks, in time past, termed the "*Quadruvials*," confirm their Propositions by infallible Demonstrations; and likewise in the Trivials, such Lessons and Directions are delivered unto us, as will effect very near, or as much altogether as every Faculty doth Promise. Now, in case we should concur to do as you advise, which is, to renounce our Common Notions, and cancel all our Theorems, Axioms, Rules, and Tenents, and to come as Babes "*Ad Regnum Naturæ*," as we are willed by Scripture to come "*Ad Regnum Cœlorum*"; there is nothing more certain to my Understanding, than that it would enstantly bring us to Barbarism, and after many thousand Years, leave us more Unprovided of Theological Furniture than we are at this present; for it were indeed to become very Babes, "*Tabula Rasa*," when we shall keep no Impression of any former Principles, but be driven to begin the World again, and to travel by Trial of Actions and Sense, (which are your Proofs by particulars) what to place in "*Intellectu*," for our General Conceptions, it being a Maxim of all Men's approving, "*In Intellectu Nihil Quod non prius fuit in Sensu*": And so in Appearance it would befall us that till Plato's Years be come about, our insight in Learning would be in less esteem than now it is accounted. As for that which you inculcate of a knowledge more excellent than now it is among us, which Experience might produce, if we would essay to retract it out of Nature by particular Probations; it is no more upon the Matter, but to cite to us that which without Instigation, by natural Instinct, Men would practise of themselves; for it cannot in reason be otherwise thought, but that there are infinite Numbers in all Parts of the World (for we may not in this case confine our cogitations within the Bounds of Europe) which embrace the course you propose with all Diligence and Care that any Ability can perform; For every Man is born with an appetite of Knowledge, wherewith he cannot be so glutted, but still as in Dropsies, they will thirst after more; but yet why they should hearken to any

such Persuasion, as wholly to abolish those settled Opinions, and general Theorems to which they have attained, and their own and their Ancestor's former Experience, *I see no thing yet alledged to induce* me to think it. Moreover, I may speak with good Probability, that if we shall make mental Survey, what is like to be effected all the World over, those five or six Inventions which you have selected, and Imagine to be but of modern Standing, will make but a slender show, among many hundreds of many kinds of Notions, which are daily brought to light by the inforcement of Wit or casual Event, and may be compared, and partly preferred above those you have named! But were it so here, that all were admitted that you can require, the Augmentation of our Knowledge, and that all our Theorems, and general Positions were utterly extinguished with a new Subscription of Others in their Places, what Hope may we have of any Benefit to Learning by this Alteration: Assuredly as soon as the New are brought "αδ ἀκμὴν," by the Inventors and their Followers, by an interchangable course of natural things, they will fall by *Degrees* to be buried in Oblivion, and so in continuance perish out-right, and that perchance upon the *like* to your present Pretences, by Proposal of some means to advance our Knowledge to a higher Pitch of Perfection; for still the same Defects Antiquity found, will reside in Mankind, and therefore other *Uses* of their *Actions*, *Devices* and *Studies*, are not to be expected than is apparently by Record in former Time observ'd. I remember here a Note which "*Paterculus*" made of the incomparable wits of the *Grecians* and *Romans*, in their flourishing States, that there might be this Reason of the notable Downfal in their issue which came after, because by Nature "*Quod Summo Studio petitum est, ascendit in Summum, difficilisq; in perfecto mora est*"; inasmuch that Men perceiving that they could not go further, being come to the top, they turned back on their own Accord, forsaking those Studies that are most in Request, and betaking themselves to new Endeavours, as if the thing they had sought had been by Prevention foreprised by others: So it fared in Particular with the Eloquence of that age, that when their Successors found they could hardly equal, but by no means excell predecessors, they began to neglect the Study thereof; and both to write and speak, for many hundred years, in a rustical Manner, till this latter Resolution brought the wheel about again, by inflaming gallant spirits to give a fresh Onset, with straining and striving to Clime unto the Height and Top of Perfection, not in that Gift alone, but

in every other Skill of any Part of Learning: For I hold it not an erroneous Conceit to think of every Science, that as now they are professed, so they have been before in all Precedent Ages, though not the like in all Places, nor at all times alike in Ours, and the same, but according to the Changes and Turnings of Times, with a more exact or plain, or with a more rude and obscure kind of Teaching. If the question should be asked what Proof I have of it? I can produce the Doctrine of Aristotle, and the deepest learned Clarks, whom we have any Means to take Notice of, that, as there is of other things, so there is of Sciences, "*Ortus* & *Interitus*;" which is also the meaning, if I should expound it, of "*Nihil novum sub Sole*," and is as well to be applied, "*ad facta*" as "*dicta*" *at Nihil neq; factum neq; dictum quod non dictum et factum prius.* I have further for my Warrant, that famous Complaint of *Solomon* to his Son, against the infinite making of Books in his time. Of which in all Congruity it must be understood, that a very great Part were Observations and Instructions in all kinds of Literature, of which there is not now so much as one petty Pamphlet (only some Part of the Bible excepted) remaining to Posterity, as there was not then any bound of Millions of Authors that were long before *Solomon*; yet we must give credit to what he affirmed, that whatsoever was then, or had been before, it could never be averred, *Behold*, this is *New*. Whereupon I must for final Conclusion infer, seeing all Endeavours, Studies, and Knowledge of *Mankind* in whatsoever *Art* or *Science*, have ever been the same as at this Present, though full of Mutabilities, according to the Changes & Accidental Occasion of Ages, and Countries, and Clarks Dispositions, which can never be but subject to *Intention* & *Remission*, both in their Desires, and in the Practices of their Knowledge; if now we should accord in opinion with you, first to Condemn our Present Knowledge of Doubts & Incertitude; but you confirm, but by *Averment*, without other Force of *Argument*, than to disclaim all our Axioms, Maxims, and general assertions that are left by *Tradition* from our Elders unto us, which have passed (as it is to be intended) all Probations of the Sharpest Wits that ever were.

And Lastly; to devise (being now become A. B. C. Darij) by the frequent spelling of *Partieulars*, to come to the Notice of New *Generals*, and so afresh to Creat New *Principles of Sciences*; the end of all would be, that when we shall be *dispossessed* of the Learning we have, all our consequent Travel will but help in a Circle to conduct us to the Place from whence we set forward,

and bring us to the Happiness to be restored "*in integrum*," which will require as many Ages, as have marched before us to be perfectly atchived. All which I write with no Dislike of encreasing our knowledge with New Devices, which is Undoubtedly a practice of high Commendation, in regard of the Benefit they will yield for the present. And the World hath ever been, and will assuredly continue full of such *Devisers*, whose Industry, *that* Way, hath been eminent, and produced strange Effects, above the Reach and Hope of Men's common capacities; yet our *Notions & Theorems* have always kept in Grace, both with them, and with the rarest that ever were nominated amongst the Learned. By this you see to what *Boldness* I am brought by your *Kindness*, that if I seem too sawcy in this Contradiction, it is the Opinion I hold of your Noble Disposition, and of the Freedom in these Cases that you will afford your special Friends, which have induced me to it. Now though I my self, like a *Carrier's* Horse, cannot blanch the beaten Way, in which I was trained, yet such is my Censure of your "*Cogitata*," that I must tell you, (to be plain), you have much wronged your self and the World, to smother such a *Treasure* so long in Your Coffer; for though I stand well assured (touching the Tenour and Subject of your main Discourse) you are not able to impannel a substantial Jury in any University that will give up a Verdict to acquit you of Error; yet it cannot be gainsaid, that all your Treatise over doth abound with choice conceits of the present State of Learning, & with so worthy Contemplations of the means to procure it, as may perswade, with any Student, to look more narrowly to his business, not only by aspiring to the greates Perfection of that which is now a Days divulged in the Sciences, but by diving yet deeper, as it were, into the Bowels and Secrets of Nature, and by Inforcing the Power of his *Judgement* and *Wit* to learn of St. Paul, *Consectari Meliora Dona*: which course would to God (*to whisper so much in your ears*) you had followed at first, *when you fell to the study of such a thing as was not Worthy of such a Student:* Nevertheless, being as it is, that you were therein settled, and your Country soundly served, I can but wish, withal my Heart, as I do very often, that you may gain a full Reward to the full of your Deserts, which I hope will come with Heaps of Happiness and Honour."

Your's to be used and Commanded,

THOMAS BODLEY.

WAS BACON EVER ABROAD? WHEN AND WHERE?

By George Stronach, M.A.

WHATEVER dubiety may exist over the visitation to the Continent by "the man of Stratford," there can be none as to the visit of Bacon to France at least—to Paris, Maine, Blois, Poictiers, Tours, and especially Navarre, the last named the scene of the first play written by William Shakespeare, *Love's Labour's Lost*, and published as "newly corrected and augmented *By W. Shakespere*, 1598." In the last number of Baconiana I endeavoured to show that the author of the plays had been abroad, and had obtained his knowledge of foreign scenes, life, and manners from a sojourn on the Continent.

Lord Campbell says: "Bacon spent three whole years in France—the most valuable of his life—and his subsequent literary eminence may be traced to his long sojourn in a foreign country during the age of preparatory studies almost as much as that of Hume or Gibbon. He first resided at Paris under the care of his father's friend, Sir Amyas Paulet . . . where 'he sought that which is most of all profitable in travel—acquaintance with the secretaries and employed men of ambassadors, and so in travelling in one country he sucked the experience of many.'* . . . His original plan had been to visit Italy, but, on inquiry, all accounts agreed that, from the rigours of the Inquisition, an English Protestant would not then have been safe in that country." This later information may be characterised as rubbish. We had ambassadors in Italy then, quite capable of guarding the lives and interests of

* Bacon's "Essay of Travel."

British subjects, despite the terrors, pains, and penalties of the "Inquisition."

In the interesting letter to Bacon addressed to Orleans by Sir Thomas Bodley, given in the last number of BACONIANA, the writer advises his young friend "Not to spend your spirits and the precious time of your travel in a captious prejudice and censuring of all things, nor in an infectious collection of base vices and fashions of men and women." Strangely enough, this is just what the author of *Love's Labour's Lost* set himself out to accomplish in the earliest of the plays. Perhaps the warning suggested the performance, and Bacon rubbed it into them right royally. His experience of the Court of Navarre proved eminently profitable, and was reproduced to the letter in *Love's Labour's Lost.*

Much of what I have to say in this number will be associated with the earliest Shakespearean drama, *Love's Labour's Lost,* written *circa* 1587-9, the first of the plays which appeared with the name "Shakespere" on the title-page. It is interesting to know that "the plot stands alone in Shakespeare's work in that it is not known to have been borrowed" (Lee's *Life of Shakespeare,* p. 51); and "In the composition of the play Shakespeare took a slight and amusing story derived from some independent source, which will, we hope, be before long discovered, and gave it a new and vital interest" (Lee in *The Gentleman's Magazine,* 1880). This "discovery" has yet to be made.

Well, it is believed that Shakspere left Stratford in 1586—abandoned it compulsorily in consequence of a small poaching affair on the estate of Sir Thomas Lucy, the original, as Dr. Lee and others maintain, of "Justice Shallow" in *1* and *2 Henry IV.* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor,* a theory which has been entirely demolished by Mrs. Carmichael Stopes (Shakespearean)

and Mr. John Hutchinson (Baconian). Unanimity for once!

Shakspere left his native town in 1586 and went to London, where he held horses at the stage door, a splendid education for the composition of *Love's Labour's Lost*, which is ascribed, as I have said, to the period 1587-9. Furnivall gives 1588-9, and Lee 1589 as the date of composition. This play, it is therefore maintained, "the man of Stratford" wrote within three years after leaving Stratford—a play so learned that it cannot be placed on the modern stage, although it was frequently produced in the days of "Eliza and our James." As Professor Stapfer says, the play "is overcumbered with learning."

Of *Love's Labour's Lost* Dr. Lee writes: "The subject matter suggests that its author had already enjoyed *extended opportunities* of surveying *London* life and manners, such as were hardly open to him in *the very first years of his settlement in the Metropolis.* '*Love's Labour's Lost*' embodies keen observation of contemporary life in many ranks of society, both in town and country, while the speeches of the hero Biron clothe much sound philosophy in masterly rhetoric."

This is splendid! The life is not *London* life but Court life at Navarre (Lee says: "The hero is the King of Navarre, in whose dominions the scene is laid")—the life of kings, princes, princesses and courtiers. We have glittering spectacles of courts and camps, foreign manners, customs, and surroundings, in short, experiences of high life of every kind as well as every manner of learning, of which "the man of Stratford," three years after leaving his native town, must have been absolutely ignorant, and which Bacon must have been thoroughly acquainted with, as he had visited the spot or spots. Dr. Lee says that Shakspere's "*extended* opportunities were hardly open

to him in the very first years of his settlement in the Metropolis." He gives the date of Shakespere's retirement from Stratford as *1586* and the date of the composition of *Love's Labour's Lost* as *1589*. May I ask him what were the "very first years of his settlement in the Metropolis?" Shakspere must have "bucked up" in those three years. *1586*: holding horses at the door of the Globe Theatre. *1589*: writing *Love's Labour's Lost*—a play "so learned, so academic, so scholastic in impression and allusion that it is unfit for popular representation" (Cowden Clarke). But, as Dr. Furnivall said, "Shakspere could then have been taking his M.A. degree." This, of course, will account for the wonderful "Shakspere" transformation scene—1586-9.

Not only is the play redolent of Baconian sentiments, as I shall show later on, but several of the characters introduced are men whom Bacon actually met and talked with when he was in the *entourage* of Sir Amyas Paulet, the English ambassador to France, and afterwards one of the "governors" of Mary Queen of Scots, at Tilbury and Fotheringay. Over and over again, in the letters of Sir Amyas, dated from Orleans, Poictiers, Tours, and elsewhere in France, we find mention made of Biron, Longaville, and Dumain, who appear as characters in *Love's Labour's Lost*. Mr. Lee says: "The names of almost all the important characters are actually identical with the contemporary leaders in French politics." These most interesting letters of Paulet will be found in a volume published by the Roxburghe Club, several of the letters being addressed to Sir Nicholas Bacon, the father of Francis, in one of which recommendation is made of a tutor to Francis, in the person of the messenger with the letter. It is to be regretted that we have none of the letters written by Francis during his stay abroad. Then we should have known if he had visited Italy.

In BACONIANA for October, 1903, I gave a letter from Sir Amyas to Burleigh, dated from Calais, describing the rough sea journey between Dover and Calais, when Francis had his first experience of a storm and sailors' "lingo," such as that used in *The Tempest.* In one of his letters to Sir Nicholas Bacon, Paulet writes: "I rejoyce moche to see that your sonne, my companion, hathe, by the grace of God, passed the brunt and perill of this journey; whereof I am the more gladd, because in the begyninge of theise last trobles yt pleased your Lordship to referr his continuance with me to my consyderation. I thank God theise dangers are past, and your sonne is safe, sound, and in good healthe, and worthie of your fatherlie favoure." This is from Poictiers, September, 1576.

From that date to March, 1578-9, Bacon was in France, on one occasion (in 1578) being sent by Paulet on a special mission to Queen Elizabeth, and all the rest of the time following the French Court in its wanderings from town to town. What more likely than a mission to Italy, as we read that the French king and the Venetian ambassador were fast friends, and met at Tours in friendly consultation with the King of Navarre and Biron, one of the heroes—in fact *the* hero—of *Love's Labour's Lost?*

There is no certainty of such a journey, although the late Mr. Begley showed, from a French life of Bacon, that Francis visited both Spain and Italy during his residence in France. This is more probable than Dr. Garnett's suggestion that Shakspere went "on a confidential errand" to Germany and returned "by way of Venice." At any rate, if Bacon did not visit Italy personally he had facilities which were beyond the command of Shakspere of obtaining information on the subject from "travelled friends" (*pace* Dr. Lee). His brother Anthony travelled in Italy on many occa-

sions; he also corresponded and stayed with the King of Navarre; Francis was the friend of Sir Thomas Wotton, for many years the English ambassador at Venice, meeting Bacon in London and returning to his post in the very year that *Othello* was written.

"Betwixt this and Italy," writes Wotton to Bacon, "I purpose to collect the memorablest observations that I have taken, and to present a copy thereof to your lordship's indulgent judgment. I shall now transport him (Mr. Meawtis) over the Alps where we will both serve your Lordship." Francis was intimate with Sir Anthony Standen, whose account of a residence in Italy Francis submitted to the Queen, in the author's absence owing to illness. He was intimate with Edward Jones, who wrote him from France full information regarding the doings of the French king, the Duc de Mayenne ("Dumain," of *Love's Labour's Lost*), and other celebrities, after the accession of the King of Navarre (Henry III.) to the throne of France as Henry IV. He was closely acquainted with Nicholas Faunt, who spent seven years "between Geneva and Italy"; and, as Birch says (8th August, 1596), "Mr. Richard Higgins, a friend of Mr. Francis Bacon, being on his travels, wrote sometimes to him, and *in his letter from Venice*, of the 8th of August, 1596, observed to him that when he wrote his last letter he thought to have troubled him with no more till his return from Venice . . . he thought proper once more to entertain Mr. Francis Bacon's remembrance with *news of Italy*."

Here we have, therefore, Bacon in communication with men who knew Italy intimately, and who could impart to him all the information necessary for the local colouring of the Italian dramas. Dr. Sidney Lee confesses it is impossible that Shakspere "could have gathered his knowledge of Northern Italy from personal observation. He doubtless owed all to the verbal

reports of travelled friends or to books, the contents of which he had a rare power of assimilating or vitalising." Let Dr. Lee trot out the friends and the books he refers to. We have *Bacon's* friends supplying him daily with foreign information—who were *Shakspere's* similarly accommodating correspondents or informants?

Another point in my argument—although I do not attach much importance to it—is the fact that in the earliest of the Shakespearean historical plays—*1 Henry IV.*—it is said "Maine, Blois, Poictiers and Tours are won away"—the very places visited by Bacon when he was in France; places, it is safe to say, that were never seen, if heard of, by "the man of Stratford."

To return to *Love's Labour's Lost,* in which one cannot but read much of young Bacon's mind, Dr. Furnivall says:—

"The best speech in the play is, of course, Biron's on the effect of love in opening men's eyes and making the world new to them." The sentiments in the play are entirely Baconian, *e.g.*,

Biron says:—

"But love, *first learnéd in a lady's eyes.*"

Bacon says:—

"Love is *first learnéd in a woman's eyes.*"

Biron says:—

"Is not love *a Hercules?*"

Bacon says:—

"What fortune can be such *a Hercules?* (as love)"

Biron says:—

"Love, with *the motion* of *all elements.*"

Bacon says:—

"Love is *the motion* that animateth *all things.*"

Biron says:—

"But for my *love* . . . where *nothing wants* that want itself doth seek."

Bacon says:—

"When we *want nothing,* there is the reason and the opportunity and the spring of *love.*"

Biron says :—

"*Love gives* to every *power* a double power."

Bacon says :—

"*Love gives* the mind *power* to exceed itself."

These quotations are taken from *Love's Labour's Lost* —the first Shakespearean play, attributed to the period 1587-9—and Bacon's masque, attributed by Spedding to 1592-3. Of course it will be said that Bacon borrowed his ideas from Shakspere. Very likely! Bacon had so few original ideas, and "the man of Stratford" had so many.

There are a few other facts connected with *Love's Labour's Lost* which are worthy of notice. An obscure event in the history of Navarre, unknown in England at the time when the play was written, although mentioned in the French *Chronicles* of Monstrelet (not translated into English until 1809), is introduced into the drama; and Dr. Furnivall says of another point :— "The meeting of Henry of Navarre [in the play] with a princess of France [is founded] on a real meeting of his with one in France in 1586"—the very year in which Bacon was in France, and, in every probability, present at the meeting.

Then we have the Baconian language in the play. "Don Armado" has been identified with Antonio Perez, the Spaniard who was befriended in England by Anthony and Francis Bacon, very much to their good mother's regret and remonstrance. Like "Armado," Perez was a "a traveller from Spain," and he published a book under the assumed name of "Raphael Peregrino." It is not surprising, therefore, to find in *Love's Labour's Lost* the statement :—

"He is too picked, too spruce, too affected, too odd, as it were, too *peregrinate*, as I may call it."

I am of opinion that when this word was used Bacon had in his eye his friend "Peregrino." He had already

called the Latin version of his "Essay on Travel" "De Peregratione in Partos Extremos." It was a natural word to Bacon—was it one natural to Shakspere?

I might instance other Baconian sentiments in the play, *e.g.* :—"This is a gift that I have; simple, simple, a foolish, extravagant spirit, full of forms, figures, shapes, objects, ideas, apprehensions, motives, revolutions; these are begot in the ventricle of memory, nourished in the womb of *pia mater*, and deliver'd upon the mellowing of occasion." Surely Bacon satirised himself here, and again in: "*Novi hominem tanquam te.* His humour is lofty, his discourse peremptory, his tongue filed, his eye ambitious, his gait majestical, and his general behaviour vain, ridiculous, and thrasonical." The conjunction of Latin and English is characteristic of Bacon, as everybody knows who has read his letters.

At any rate, the clever—if bombastic—language of *Love's Labour's Lost* seems to me to be that of a young student fresh from the schools rather than that of an ex-poacher who held horses at a stage door three years before its composition.

Shakespeare's second play is said to have been *The Comedy of Errors*, where, according to Furnivall (he dates it 1589-91), "The quip and crank, the word-play, rhyme, doggerel, etc., of *Love's Labour's Lost* are continued, though they are not so overdone." If this was the same play—*A Historie of Errors*—acted in January, 1576-7, and January, 1582-3, then Shakspere, of Stratford, never wrote it. Both plays were adapted from the *Menœchmi* of Plautus, no translation of which was published till 1595, so that the writer was acquainted with Plautus in the original Latin. In the play the abstruse legal problem of "Fine and Recovery" is treated in the same way as in Bacon's *Use of the Law*.

Then, again, the description in the play of the vines climbing upon stakes in the vineyards in the South of France, and of the elms in Italy, was more likely to have come from the pen of Bacon, who had *probably* seen them, than from that of Shakspere, who *certainly* had never had the opportunity. But this is not all. In the play Proteus is described as being *held by the sleeve*, when captured. In the *Sylva Sylvarum* Bacon says the same—in fact, perpetrates the same blunder as all the classic writers; Homer, Ovid, Virgil, Hyginus, etc., maintain that Proteus was *bound by a chain*, not *held by the sleeve*. In the play the Abbess attributes indigestion to "unquiet meals," and Bacon, a martyr to dyspepsia all his life, ascribes it to "strife at meats," while the author of the play and Bacon agree in a wonderful manner as to the doctrine of "the human soul"—"the rational and irrational soul" (*De Augmentis*) and "the natural man and the spirit" (*Comedy of Errors*). Other points of resemblance to be found in both *Love's Labour's Lost* and *The Comedy of Errors* and the writings of Bacon are marvellous. They convince me at least that Bacon wrote both plays, and that it is certain that if the dates of composition are approximately correct (Furnivall 1588-9 and 1589-91) the man (or boy) who left Stratford in 1586 had no hand in them. Both works were written by a scholar who was also a philosopher—not by an actor who, three years previous to their composition, was also a poacher and a seducer, although, as Dr. Sidney Lee says, in his problematical *Life of Shakespeare*:—"Shakespeare, it should be remembered, MUST *have been a regular attendant at the parish church, and* MAY *at times have enjoyed a sermon.*"

Happy Shakspere!

BACON'S TRAVELS

I ONCE hazarded a guess that Bacon visited Italy in 1588. On further study, it seems more probable that he went there in 1590. In 1589, writing anonymously under the name of Pasquil, he had taken an active part in endeavouring to kill the Martinist schism in the English Church by the only method which seemed to him likely to be successful—ridicule.

In one of his pamphlets his method is thus explained :—

"Contention is a coale, the more it is blowne by dysputation the more it kindleth ; I must spit in theyre faces to put it out."

In January, 1589-90, he published the first part of the "Faerie Queene." On 6th April following Sir Francis Walsingham, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, died. Bacon promptly published in the pen-name of "Watson" a Latin Eglogue in Walsingham's memory. On the 15th April was entered S.R. 'The Royal Exchange,' being a translation of a short Italian pamphlet which Bacon published in the name of Greene, and to which he added a valuable glosse.

From this point until November there was a cessation of Bacon's literary activities consistent, I think, with an absence abroad.

The fact that Henry IV. of France at the latter end of 1589 had turned Catholic made it prudent that France and the friendly Catholic States of Austria and Venetia should be assured that Elizabeth was on the best of terms with her own Catholic subjects, and that the schism amongst her Protestant subjects was unimportant. With a hostile Pope, and the forces of equally hostile Spain still in possession of the neighbouring coast of the Netherlands, the Catholic volte face in France was most disquieting to England. Bacon

accordingly drafted an important letter of State dealing with the Queen's relations with her Catholic and Protestant subjects and submitted it to Archbishop Whitgift. It was then signed by Walsingham. Whether the letter was at once forwarded by Queen's messenger, or waited for a diplomatist to carry it, is not known.

But Walsingham's death and the Queen's nervous apprehensions would render it desirable that a skilled diplomatist should visit the Courts of France, Austria and Venetia. Sir Thomas Bodley, who had in previous years undertaken secret confidential errands of this kind for the Queen, was not then available, as he had become Minister Resident at the Hague. I think that in "Francesco's Fortunes," printed towards the end of 1590 in the name of Greene, Bacon does in his own cryptic way indicate that he had then recently undertaken a continental journey. He makes one of his characters refer to a journey by way of Dover to Calais, then to Paris (where he visited the French Court), then to Lyons, thence coasting (avoiding) the Alps, and through Germany to Vienna and afterwards to Venice.

In the person of the character in the novel, comments are made upon the French, Germans and Italians. If Bacon did visit Venice after Vienna, the proper way to have gone would have been to follow the regular trade route through Innsbruck, Botzena, Trient, Verona and Padua, then "unto the tranect the common ferry which trades to Venice" (*Merchant of Venice*). From the mention of Bergamo in "Francesco's Fortunes" and of the same city in the pamphlet, "An Almond for a Parrot," published later than the summer of 1590 (another lampoon upon the Martinists), it is likely that he returned by way of Bergamo to Coire and thence through Germany to Stade, a seaport at the mouth of the Elbe, having a regular shipping trade to England.

Fynes Moryson went that way six years later, his journey occupying two months; but, of course, he was sightseeing. Bacon could not safely have returned through France owing to the war waging between the French King and the Spanish forces from the Netherlands then invading France.

In "Francesco's Fortunes" Bacon shows great displeasure at the drinking habits of the Germans of the period. As Nash in "Pierce Pennilesse," in 1592, he recorded still stronger antipathy to the contemporary swaggering and drink-swilling Danish cavaliers. As Nash also in "A Prognostication," printed in 1591, he seems again to hark back to a journey commenced at Dover and finished at the flat coast around Stade, a district dominated by the Danes. The words are: "Sitting gentlemen upon Dover Cliffes to quaint myself with the art of navigation and know the tides, as *the Danske crowes gather on the sands* against a storm." Perusal of Bacon's writings under the pen-names of "Greene" and "Nash" suggests very firmly the conclusion that the writer had more than a book acquaintance with the respective habits and characteristics of both Danes, Spaniards, Italians and Germans. If he started in May, or even June, he had ample time to be back in London in October.

I do not think the privately printed pamphlet, "Pasquil's Apology," purporting to have been published "on 2nd July 1590 at London stone," is inconsistent with the taking of the journey suggested.

This pamphlet was entered S.R. on 22nd December, 1589, so that he had written it long before it was published and probably left it with Whitgift or Bishop Bancroft to print at their private press some time after he had left the country; so that if the Martinists had ever suspected his handiwork in previous

pamphlets, this publication would throw them off the scent.

I doubt whether Bacon ever visited Elsinore. As the writer of *Hamlet*, he could record from hearsay the cannon-firing custom when the Danish King drank a health, and also the tapestry portraits of Danish kings at Cronburg Castle. Had he visited Elsinore he would not have described the coast as a cliff. Upon existing lists of names of the English actors who visited Elsinore in 1585, Shakspere is not included. The special pleading that he was there, adumbrated by Herr Stefansson in the *Contemporary Review* for 1896 is therefore beside the mark. The argument that the writer of the Shakespeare plays of *Merchant of Venice*, *Othello*, *Taming of the Shrew* and *Romeo and Juliet* had some acquaintance with the Italian *loci in quo* has more substance, although I am disposed to agree with the *Quarterly Reviewer* in his article in July, 1889, that these plays could have been written by one who had no first-hand knowledge of the towns and districts in which their action is depicted as taking place. Nevertheless, if Bacon did pay a flying visit to Venice in 1590 he would be bound to see Verona and Padua, and it becomes significant that a play called a *Venetian Comedy*, which I have little doubt was the *Merchant of Venice*, was performed in August, 1594.

In the dedication to *Cornelia* (the play which Bacon in the name of Kyd translated from the French of Garnier), entered S.R. January 1593-4, Bacon promised a play in the ensuing summer upon the subject of Garnier's "Porcie." The Venetian comedy (*Merchant of Venice*, with its introduction of Portia) played in August, 1594, was evidently the fulfilment of the promise.

My suggestions are put forward quite tentatively,

and I trust may assist the discussion Mr. Stronach has been good enough to initiate.

PARKER WOODWARD.

P.S.—I think Sir William Herbert possibly alluded to a recent journey abroad in his verses addressed to the author of *Lucrece* and *Cornelia*, printed 1594, an extract from which I give below:

"You that to shew your wits have taken toyle
In registering the deeds of noble men,
And sought for matter on a foreign soyle
As worthier subjects for your silver pen."

"SHAKESPEARE AND VENICE"

MR. HORATIO F. BROWN has been described as "the greatest living English authority on things Venetian." He has written several admirable books on Venice—its history and its institutions. Recently his Venetian Studies have been re-published by Mr. John Murray with considerable additions thereto under the title of "Studies in the History of Venice." It comprises a series of essays full of information, presented in a most interesting and acceptable manner, and will amply repay a careful perusal. The twenty-two pages which are devoted to "Shakespeare and Venice" justify its inclusion in every Shakespearean library, and this essay alone forms the subject of the present comments.

The author treats of Shakespeare's knowledge of Venice and things Venetian, as exhibited in the plays, with special reference as to whether they bear evidence that the author was ever in Venice.

He commences by laying down the principles upon which his investigation is to be conducted.

"There is perhaps no region of intuitive knowledge which we may safely affirm to lie beyond the reach of the poetic imagination."

"The power to grasp some trifling indication, some fugitive

hint, and from it to reconstruct a whole scheme of things which shall in all essentials correspond to fact is peculiarly the poet's gift."

In illustration of this, Mr. Brown says:—

"When Shakespeare tells us, for example, of 'regions of thick ribbed ice,' we are not to suppose that he ever threaded the seracs of an icefall, though no poet ever devised a juster epithet than 'thick ribbed' to describe the colossal cleavage of a glacier."

The illustration is an unfortunate one. When Claudio uses the expression he is not referring to a glacier which either he or anyone else has seen. In endeavouring to picture to Isabella the horrors of that undiscovered country from whose bourn no traveller returns, he lets his imagination run riot:—

> "Ay, but to die, and go we know not where;
> To lie in cold obstruction, and to rot;
> This sensible warm motion to become
> A kneaded clod; and the delighted spirit
> To bathe in fiery floods, or to reside
> In thrilling regions of thick ribbed ice;
> To be imprison'd in the viewless winds
> And blown with restless violence round about
> The pendant world; or to be worse than worst
> Of those, that lawless and uncertain thoughts
> Imagine howling! 'Tis too horrible!"

Shakespeare did not apply the epithet "thick ribbed" to describe the colossal cleavage of a glacier. Bathing in "fiery floods," residing in "thrilling regions of thick ribbed ice" and being "imprison'd in the viewless winds" are imaginative ideas, and are not descriptive of actual scenes in which the "intuitive knowledge of the poet could in all essentials correspond to fact." This is a bad start, because the illustration leaves it open to doubt as to what is the exact principle which the writer desires to lay down.

"There is, however, another kind of knowledge—a

knowledge of minute facts in detail, which no imagination can fairly be expected to compass; a knowledge which we may justly call information." So says Mr. Horatio Brown, and he goes on to state that his object is to inquire how much knowledge Shakespeare possessed about Venice and the Venetian dominions; about the customs of the Republic, her laws, her state, about the habits of the Venetians, their mode of life and character.

It will be very interesting to see what is the value of the evidence adduced in support of the writer's contention that Shakespeare never visited Italy or Venice, for he does not proceed to conduct an impartial inquiry as to whether Shakespeare in his references to Italy and Italian subjects was speaking from actual experience. He starts off by accepting as a definite conclusion that which he proposes to inquire into. "As we shall see," he says, "the scattered allusions to be collected from the plays prove an intimacy with Venice which is surprising in a man who probably was never out of England."

Thus bad begins, but worse remains behind, for he continues: "We must conclude that all he had heard about Venice made him love the city, and that his burning imagination vivified the picture of it created by his fancy. We know how deep an interest he took in Italy and in all things Italian, and we surmise that he made good use of his opportunities to gather a considerable store of information about Italy in general and about Venice in particular."

This is the usual reckless method of expression adopted by superficial writers. Mr. Horatio Brown is referring to the man of Stratford, who probably was never out of England; about him he does not know, as he states he does, "how deep an interest he took in Italy and in all things Italian." He does not know

that he took the slightest interest in any country but his own, in any literature of any description, in any kind of art, in any single branch of culture. "It appears that in some way or other," he continues, "Shakespeare had learned sufficient Italian to understand that language. In his Italian plays he introduces enough to prove his familiarity with its use."

Before the value of the evidence to be obtained "from the scattered allusions to be collected from the plays" is considered, it is stated that :—

"Two main sources of information were open to the poet : first, the merchant class, whose relations with Venice dated from times as early as the year 1325, and were cemented by the yearly passage of the Venetian merchantmen, known as the Flanders galleys ; and secondly, the travelled members of the aristocracy, the young gentlemen who returned to England with indelible memoirs of Italy, and all the charm of that pleasant land ; who filled the town with talk of Italian cities, and made Venice, in a certain way, the mode, so that Sir John, for example, assures Mistress Ford that were she his lady her arched brow would become 'The ship-tire, the tire valiant, or any tire of Venetian admittance.'"

How simple is the explanation if the plays were written by a young travelled member of the aristocracy.

Now for the evidence, which may be divided into two categories—the mistakes which Shakespeare makes about Italy and things Italian—the peculiar and precise knowledge which he appears to have possessed about Italy and things Italian.

Some evidence is inherently of more value than other. The writer of this article during the past three years has visited Berlin probably forty times, Paris twenty, and Amsterdam a dozen, and yet in writing in England any description of those cities he would probably make scores of mistakes, but those descriptions would contain certain statements which on investigation would be

found so accurate that they could only be the result of actual eyesight and experience.

So, in order to arrive at a just conclusion it is necessary to weigh the strength of the evidence of mistakes about Venice and compare it with that of the "intimacy with Venice."

The mistakes alleged in the article are :—

1. Verona is described in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* as a port upon the sea with tides that ebb and flow and boats may sail from thence to Milan—Valentine's father "at the road expects his coming, there to see him shipped"; and Launce, weeping over the misdemeanours of his dog Crab, his cruel-hearted cur, is like to lose the tide.

2. Verona is still a seaport in *Othello*, where Cassio's ship, the first to reach Cyprus after the storm, is a Veronesa.

3. Verona, being a seaport, the trade of a sailmaker was carried on by Tranio's father at Bergamo, which is not far distant from it.

4. In Shakespear's Lombardy, though not in the real Lombardy, there is mountainous territory between Milan and Mantua; the Duke bids Porteous and Sir Thurio meet him "upon the rising of the mountain foot that leads towards Mantua."

5. When we pass inside the city of Venice with him we feel that he has never "swum in a gondola," except in fancy; there are too many evidences that he did not know the sea-girt city, its waterways, its little *calli*, those narrow streets whose windings form such a delightful labyrinth in which the traveller may lose himself. Examples given :

(*a*.) Dobbin, old Gobbo's fillhorse, would never have been allowed to jog along the narrow *calli* of the town.

(*b.*) Shylock's house is more Florentine than Venetian; his orders to Jessica are

"Clamber not you up to the casements."

The casements were high in Florence, the graceful Gothic windows are low-silled in Venice.

(*c.*) Gratiano and Salarino would not have found a pent house under which to take their stand in any Venetian street; a true pent house, as distinguished from a sotto portico, were it ever so narrow, would have filled most Venetian alleys from side to side.

6. There are certain evidences in the *Merchant of Venice* of a want of knowledge of Venetian law:—

The rate of interest was established by law, and Shylock could not have recovered in any Court of Venice, so Antonio could not have rated him many a time and oft as to his excesses. No mention is made of discharging the case—*Shylock* v. *Antonio*—only of adjourning it, but the Court had the power to discharge it.

Shylock was not in danger as long as he remained within the law; but his usury would have put him outside the pale.

For Jessica, a Jewess, to wed Lorenzo, a Christian, would have brought both of them before the Court of the Esecutori contro la Bestemmia and placed them in peril of their lives.

Whilst Shakespeare is aware that the true title of the prince is Doge or Duke, he does not know the Doge's proper style of address, which for an Englishman would be "Your Grace," but for Venetians "Your Serenity." It is improbable that the doge would himself have sat in Court at the trial. He only sat at the Council of the Ten, and then chiefly when the Court was trying for treason.

Had he been present, there was no need to entreat

the learned lawyer, Balthazar, home to dinner, for the doge was already at home in the ducal palace.

Mr. Horatio Brown devotes several pages to various theories which have been propounded as to the origin of the play of *Othello*, but there are no arguments to be obtained from these in support of his contention that the author had not visited Italy. The arguments advanced in support of the contrary proposition will be considered when the evidence for the affirmative is dealt with.

1. The treatment of Verona in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* is the most important—it may be said the only important—point made.

"For instance, Verona is a port, upon the sea, with tides that ebb and flow."

The text hardly justifies this statement. Valentine says to Protheus

> "My father at the road
> Expects my coming, there to see me shipped,"

and directly after Speed meets Protheus and says :—

> Sir, Protheus, save you : saw you my master ?
> *Pro :* But now be parted hence, to embark for Milan.
> *Speed :* Twenty to one then, he is shipp'd already ;
> And I have played the sheep, in losing him.

Then follows further play on the word sheep, and the conversation ends by Protheus saying

> Go, go, be gone, to save your ship from wreck,
> Which cannot perish having thee aboard,
> Being destined to a drier death on shore.

In Act II., Scene 2, Protheus is taking leave of Julia :—

> My father stays my coming : answer not ;
> The tide is now : Nay, not thy tide of tears ;
> That tide will stay me longer than I should ;

In the next scene, still laid in Verona, Panthino meets Launce, and the following dialogue occurs :—

Pant: Launce, away, away, aboard; thy master is shipp'd and thou art to post after him with oars.
What's the matter? Why weep'st thou, man? Away, ass;
You will lose the tide if you tarry any longer.
Launce: It is no matter if the ty'd were lost; for it is the unkindest ty'd that ever any man ty'd.
Pant: What's the unkindest tide?
Launce: Why, he that's ty'd here; Crab, my dog.
Pant: Tut man, I mean thou'lt lose the flood; and in losing the flood, lose thy voyage; and in losing thy voyage, lose thy master; and in losing thy master, lose thy service; and in losing thy service—
Why dost thou stop my mouth?
Launce: For fear thou should'st lose thy tongue.
Pant: Where should I lose my tongue?
Launce: In thy tale.
Pant: In thy tail?
Launce: Lose the tide, and the voyage, and the master, and the service, and the tide? Why man if the river were dry, I am able to fill it with my tears; if the wind were down, I could drive the boat with my sighs.

It is *the river* and *the boat*, not *the sea* and *the ship* that Launce refers to.

When Protheus is leaving Valentine after their meeting in Milan, he says:—

Go on before I shall enquire you forth.
I must unto the road, to disembark
Some necessaries that I needs must use;

Speed and Launce meet in Milan and the former says:—

How now, signior Launce? What news with your mastership?
Launce: With my master's ship? Why, it is at sea.
Speed: Well, your old vice still; mistake the word:

The foregoing passages contain "the scattered allusions" which form the main justification for the con-

tention that Shakespeare could never have visited Italy. In Act IV., Scene 1, laid in a forest near Mantua, Valentine is met by outlaws, and the following conversation takes place :—

2nd Outlaw: Whither travel you?
Valentine: To Verona.
1st Outlaw: Whence came you?
Valentine: From Milan.

Shakespeare is, therefore, taking Valentine back in a manner consistent with the geography of the country, so that his ignorance was not complete. How is it possible to explain the passages which certainly refer to a journey either for part of the way or for the entire journey by water? It will be observed that the sea is never mentioned in connection with the journey. Launce speaks of the river, if dry, being replenished by his tears, and the boat being driven by his sighs if the winds fail. Panthio also refers to Launce having to post after his master with oars. The words "ship" and "tide" are in each case introduced for the purpose of reeling off puns. When all is said, in view of the present knowledge possessed, it is a matter of opinion whether this lapse in the geography of Shakespeare would justify the assumption that he could never have been in Italy; as Valentine's journey back from Milan to Verona was undertaken by land and not by water, it is open to argument that Shakespeare introduced the references to ships and tides for the purpose of developing the misuse of those words.

One other point may be made. Did Shakespeare once more, know more than his critics? Upper Italy, as early as the sixteenth century, was intersected with canals, and was there a watercourse by which, at any rate, part of the journey might be performed, possibly *via* the Lake of Garda, by boat? The subject is worth investigation.

The play was not printed until it appeared in the folio edition of 1623. Meres, however, writing in 1598, mentions it. Malone assigns it to the year 1595. It is, undoubtedly, founded on a romance entitled *Diana in Love*, written in Spanish by George de Montemayor, before 1561, but not translated into English until 1598, after the play had been written.

It is substantially identical with *The History of Felix and Philomena*, a play produced in January, 1585, before the Queen, at Greenwich. No author's name is given in the record. Collier agrees in the identity of the two plays, but for the fact that Montemayor's romance was not translated into English, and could not, therefore, have been accessible to the dramatist. If Shakespeare could read Spanish the difficulty would be removed. As to this, Elze says,* "Could there be anything more to the point than the description he gives in *Love's Labour's Lost* of the Spanish language? Can one who describes the character of a language with such clearness and insight be unacquainted with it?" Upon these premises Mr. Edwin Reed assigns the play "with reasonable certainty to the year 1584." Mr. C. Armitage Brown, writing in 1838, admits that nothing can shake his faith in Shakespeare's travels in Italy, and suggests the year 1593 as the probable date. He attributes the geographical confusion in the play to its having been written before that date.

The early commentators were sceptical as to its authorship. Upton determines "that if any proof can be drawn from manner and style, this play must be sent packing and seek for its parent elsewhere." Hanmer doubted whether Shakespeare had any other hand in this play than the enlivening it with some speeches and lines thrown in here and there, which are easily distinguished, as being of a different stamp from the rest.

* Elze's Shakespeare, page 385.

Having regard to all these circumstances it may reasonably be urged that any loose geography in *Two Gentlemen of Verona* does not warrant the assertion that the author of the plays never was in Italy.

2. Verona is still a seaport in *Othello*, where Cassio's ship, the first to reach Cyprus after the storm, is a Veronesa.

Here the task of the apologist is easy, for Shakespeare never said anything of the kind. This is the passage, as printed in the quarto 1622 and the folio 1623.

Third Gen: A Noble ship of Venice
Hath seene a grievous wracke and sufferance
On most part of their fleet.
Montano: How? Is this true?
Third Gen: The ship is heere put in: *a Verennessa, Michael Cassio,*
Lieutenant to the warlike Moore, Othello,
Is come on Shore.

Theobald substituted Veronese for Verennessa, and altered the punctuation, placing the colon after it and making it refer to the ship instead of to Cassio, thus:

The ship is here put in, a Veronese: Michael Cassio,
Lieutenant, &c.

Collier points out that as the third gentleman has already described the ship as "of Venice," "it is not likely that he would assert just afterwards that she was Veronese; it seems much more probable that he would call Cassio, whom he did not know, a Veronese."

Be the explanation what it may, Shakespeare cannot be held guilty of a geographical error on the reading of the text as he left it.

3. Bergamo is close to the Lake of Garda, where, according to Mr. Horatio Brown, the Venetians kept their war galleys floating, so the idea is not far-fetched that there should be a sail-maker there. Scene I. of

Act V. of *Taming of the Shrew*, in which the reference occurs, is laid in Padua. Why should Shakespeare fix on Bergamo and on sail-making as the trade of Tranio's father unless he had some actual knowledge of the place which suggested the connection? The mistake, if it be a mistake, is of a very trivial character.

4. When, in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, the Duke bids Protheus and Thurio meet him,

> "Upon the rising of the mountain foot
> That leads toward Mantua,"

it is urged that this is another blunder, as there is no mountainous territory between Milan and Mantua. "Perhaps," says Mr. Horatio Brown, "the poet was thinking of the Euganeæn Hills, but put these on the near instead of on the farther side of Mantua." This appears just such a mistake as a man would make who had passed through the country but had not stayed long enough to fasten in his mind the topography of the neighborhood. It is far too slight to justify the assumption that the poet could never have visited Italy.

5. There is no suggestion in the *Merchant of Venice* that Gobbo's horse, Dobbin, jogged along the narrow *calli*. Here is the text:—

> *Gobbo:* Lord worship might he be, what a beard hast thou got; thou hast got more haire on thy chin, then Dobbin my phil-horse has on his taile.
>
> *Lancelot:* It should seem then that Dobbin's taile growes backward. I am sure he had more haire of his taile then I have of my face when I last saw him.

What is the difficulty here?
Shylock's admonition to Jessica,

> "Clamber not you up to the casements then
> Nor thrust your head into the public street,"

may pass without comment, even if Shakespeare had in his mind's eye the Florentine building instead of the

Venetian, as may also Gratiano's remark to Salarino:

> "This is the penthouse under which
> Lorenzo desires us to make a stand."

All these inaccuracies, if they be inaccuracies, are introduced in so circumstantial a manner, as to convey the impression that the poet was speaking from the recollection of actual observation even if his memory failed as to details.

Turning to the other side, the author of the play's "intimacy with Venice," Mr. Brown says:—

"Yet in spite of this ideal geography we are startled, every now and then, by a touch of topographical accuracy so just as almost to persuade us that Shakespeare must have seen with outward eye the country which his fancy pictures; must have travelled there, and carried thence a recollection of its bearings.

For to return to the *Merchant of Venice*, Portia says to Balthasar:

> 'Take this same letter,
> And use thou all th' endeavour of a man
> In speed to Padua: see thou render this
> Into my cousin's hand, Doctor Bellario;
> And, look, what notes and garments he doth give thee,
> Bring them, I pray thee, with imagin'd speed
> Unto the tranect,° to the common ferry
> Which trades to Venice. Waste no time in words,
> But get thee gone: I shall be there before thee.'

° Coryat (Crudities i. 210) says: "There are in Venice thirteen ferries or passages, which they commonly call *traghetti*." Moryson, in his *Itinerary* i. 77, similarly describes the traghetti. Staunton suggests, therefore, that "Tranect," no other use of the word being known, is probably a misprint for "Tragect." Karl Elze, who maintains that the only possible explanation of the poet's exact local knowledge of Italy is that he visited Italy (Essays, 1873, p. 279), says: What visitor does not here at once recognize the Venetian traghetto (tragetto)? And whence did the poet get a knowledge of the traghetto? Coryat is out of the question, and Vecellio, even if he knew that Shakespeare had read the book, which we do not, has not a word about the traghetto, so that the disbelievers in an Italian journey of Shakespeare cannot account for his knowledge by any other means than by oral communication.

They are at her country house of Belmont, which we may conjecture to be Montebello, just beyond Vicenza. Portia intends to reach Venice by the *burchio della Brenta*, the common ferry-boat which started from Padua and was towed leisurely down the pleasant stream, past Dola and La Mira and Malcontenta, and put into the laggon at Lizza Fusina. It is possible that Shakespeare had heard that quaint and travelled gentleman, Fiennes Moryson, describe the *burchio* and its motley crew. 'The boat is covered with arched hatches,' he says, 'and there is very pleasant companye, so a man beware to give no offence; for otherwise the Lumbards carry shirts of male, and being armed as if they were in camp, are apt to revenge upon shameful advantages. But commonly there is pleasant discourse, and the proverb saith that the boat shall be drowned when it carries neither monk, nor student, nor curtisan.'"

However that may be, the poet knew that there was such a ferry and such a boat. Balthasar is despatched before to meet his mistress at the ferry, with documents and lawyers' gowns, which he got from Dr. Bellario, whose namesakes live in Padua to this day. Portia, with Nerissa, follows in her coach; and how far is it that they have to drive between Belmont and Padua?

For we must measure twenty miles to-day—twenty miles! exactly the distance between Montebello and the gate of Padua. If Montebello and Belmont be identical, this is surely most surprisingly accurate; yet we cannot believe that this accuracy is due to more than a striking but fortuitous coincidence.

After referring to the casements and penthouse, he continues:—

"But although slight indications such as these induce us to conclude that Shakespeare never saw Venice, it is impossible to deny the truth of local colour which pervades the play. It is that salient point the Rialto, its mere sound and name, which give to the setting of the drama the strong Venetian flavour which it undoubtedly possesses. The fame of the great arch, which had been thrown across the Grand Canal soon after Shakespeare's birth, had, no doubt, reached England; and it is round Rialto that Shakespeare has gathered his own Venetian knowledge; it is about the

Rialto that his fancy builds up the Venice he desires his audience to see. We are made to feel the crowd upon the bridge and at the foot of its long flight of stairs; we picture Antonio sauntering with his friends, waiting for news of his galleys, and Shylock creeping by, eyeing and eyed askance, and now and then tormented by the boys as they recognise the yellow sign of his Jewish blood upon his breast or his cap. In the characters of the play, too, the Venetian flavour is for the most part successfully maintained. Portia is most thoroughly Venetian; so also are Shylock and Antonio; indeed the Jew is not more distinctly Jewish than Venetian in many respects; the average Venetian merchant—not Antonio, of course, for he is meant to be an exception—and his Jewish rivals were, we suspect, at no time very different in their methods of conducting business. There is only one point where the Venetian quality of the play is violated—that is in the portrayal of the country clowns, Gobbo the Elder and Launcelot, his son. They are both peasant-bred, but their note, the tone of their conversation and their humour, is English, or at least not Italian. It is in Portia, Shylock and Rialto that we catch the purest aroma of Venice which the play exhales.

"If we ask how far do stray touches and phrases in this drama show on the part of the playwright a knowledge of Venetian habits, laws and customs, we shall find several points worthy of notice. Whether the poet drew his character of Antonio from the merchant-prince Fugger, as has been suggested; whether he was aware of the great German exchange-house, the Fondaco dei Tedeschi, which existed in Venice, or not, he is certainly fully alive to the fact that commercial relations between Venice and Germany were of the closest description. With no German city was trade more active than with Frankfort; and Shakespeare

shows his information on this point when he makes Shylock in his misery recall his business transactions in that city, and the diamond he bought there." . . . "Shylock's confidence that he will receive pure justice from the Venetian tribunals is true to fact and honourable to the Republic; Antonio recognises this when he says:—

> 'The Duke cannot deny the course of law;
> For the commodity that strangers have
> With us in Venice, if it be denied,
> Will much impeach the justice of his state;
> Since that the trade and profit of the city
> Consisteth of all nations.'

"That states the truth about Venetian commercial policy; the great freedom and security she always allowed to strangers, which accounted for so much of her prosperity, and for the rooted affection which her dependencies bore towards her—an affection which manifested itself after the wars of the League of Cambray, when the liberated cities voluntarily returned to their allegiance towards St. Mark."

And again:—

"The whole of the first act of *Othello* is full of the spirit of Venice, which the poet has known how to breathe into his words. The dark night, the narrow streets, Brabantio's house with close-barred doors and shutters, the low voices of Iago and Rodrigo, the sudden uproar springing up out of the quiet night, the torches and lacqueys, the 'knave of common hire,' the gondolier, the doge and senators in council, their indignation at their brother patrician's wrongs, Othello's calm and noble statement of his wooing, how he sped by tales of moving accidents, and histories so strange as to tempt us almost to believe that Shakespeare had studied Marco Polo's 'Voyages;' Brabantio's bitter, resentful, unforgiving warning:—

> 'Look to her, Moor, if thou have eyes to see:
> She has deceived her father, and may thee,'

all this is admirably conceived to picture forth one full night in Venice.

"As in the comedy Portia is the type of the brilliant, playful, sprightly, Venetian lady, so in the tragedy Desdemona personifies the gentle, loving, submissive, patient type, so dear to the Italians. . . ."

And again :—

"We would draw attention to a few other points and touches which help to throw light on the extent of Shakespeare's knowledge of Venice, Venetian territory, and Venetian people. When Brabantio unwilling and with an ill grace resigns his daughter to the Moor, he says to Desdemona :—

> 'For your sake, jewel,
> I am glad at soul I have no other child ;
> For thy escape would teach me tyranny,
> To hang clogs on them.'

"It is possible that in this passage Shakespeare is thinking of those high pattens which were then in favour with Venetian ladies. They were worn so enormously high that a lady required the attendance of two lacqueys, upon whose shoulders she leaned for support when she went abroad. The story in St. Disdier's 'La Ville et la Republique de Venise,' already quoted, appears to throw light on Shakespeare's intention in this passage. The French traveller relates that the Ambassador of France, in conversation with the Doge, remarked once that shoes would be much more convenient ; whereupon one of the ducal councillors broke in severely, 'Yes, far, far too convenient.' Again, Brabantio, when he learns his daughter's flight, calls for some 'special officers of night ;' would Shakespeare have thought of such a strange and picturesque description of the night patrol had he not known that in Venice those officers bore the title of *Signori di Notte,*

lords of the night? The poet is aware that Padua possessed a university, and was a famous *nursery of arts;* this is not surprising when we recollect how many Englishmen went to study in that city. But more than this, he knew that Padua belonged to Venice, and that Mantua did not. Tranio tells the pedant:—

> 'Tis death for any one in Mantua
> To come to Padua. Know you not the cause?
> Your ships are stayed at Venice, and the duke,
> For private quarrel 'twixt your duke and him,
> Hath published and proclaimed it openly.'

"It was surely not a little for a London play-actor to know so much of the complicated political geography of Italy. In the passage just quoted the term 'pedant' declares that Tranio shall ever be the patron, that is *padrone,* master of his life and liberty. We do not know if 'Sound as a fish,' an expression which passes from Launce to Speed in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona,* was an English proverb in use at Shakespeare's date, but 'sano come un pesce' certainly was, and is a good Italian proverb to this day."

And again:—

"Shakespeare is aware, too, of the right use of Italian Gentile names. Lucentio, in *The Taming of the Shrew,* describes his father as 'Vincentio come of the Bentivolii,' that is, Vincenzo de' Bentivoglii."

What would be the verdict of an intelligent jury after listening to the testimony of Mr. Brown?

Must it not be this:—We find that the plays *Two Gentlemen of Verona, The Merchant of Venice, Othello,* and *Taming of the Shrew,* contain a knowledge of minute facts in detail which no imagination can fairly be expected to compass, and which can only have been obtained and reproduced by a man who had travelled through Italy. Mr. Brown starts by referring to a man

(Shakespere, of Stratford) who probably was never out of England. *Ergo*, he could not have been the author of the plays.

THE GRAVE'S TIRING-ROOM

By Mr. J. E. Roe.

IN our paper in the April issue of Baconiana under the foregoing title, we purposely avoided all conclusions touching the poem subscribed I. M. there under review further than they could be made to appear by the quotations themselves, which included Son. 68. That Sonnet involved the ultimate purpose of our paper, viz., the dead fleece of Bacon's first, and the beginning, subsequent to his fall, of a second literary period, and on second head.

The claim that all of the poems introductory to the plays were products of Bacon's pen, notwithstanding the appending of other names to them, we had distinctly laid long before they were claimed to contain cyphers.

But as the dead fleece and second life of the Sonnet are also touched in the poem I. M., we thought, if there was any change in Bacon's cypher methods in living that second life, some touch of it, indicated by cypher, might be looked for in this particular poem, standing, as it does, introductory to the plays, and framed by Bacon's own pen, touching not only the removal by death of his own cover, weed, nom-de-plume, or mask—Shake-speare—but also touching the printed worth of that dead fleece, and which poem is in these words :—

"To the memory of Mr. W. Shakespeare.
We wonder'd, Shakespeare, that thou went'st so soon
From the world's stage to the grave's tiring-room :

We thought thee dead ; but this thy printed worth
Tells thy spectators that thou went'st but forth
To enter with applause. An actor's art
Can die, and live to act a second part :
That's but an exit of mortality,
This a re-entrance to a plaudit."—I. M.

Touching the use of this word "plaudit," we quote Bacon thus : "A popular judge is a deformed thing : and plaudits are fitter for players than for magistrates" (Sped. L.l. vi. 211). In our former paper we gave his use of the word touching the removal by death of Augustus Cæsar, who signified that his life was but a play.

To show Bacon familiar with the thought involved in the words of the poem, "The Grave's Tiring-room," we quote from his essay concerning the muses, entitled "The Sirens, or Pleasures," what he says of the taking off of Petronius, "He who, having been condemned to death, sought, in the very waiting-room of death, for matter to amuse him," etc. Note in our former paper what he says of his own retirement. The "plaudit" due to this second part, or this second coming forth of the poem, and the "second life on second head" of the Sonnet, is an allusion by Bacon, we judge, to that great yet untold tale referred to by him in Aphorism 97 of his "Novum Organum," where he compares or contrasts his own doings with those of Alexander the Great, and says :—

"But if a man of mature age, unprejudiced senses, and clear mind would betake himself anew to experience and particulars, we might hope much more from such a one ; in which respect we promise ourselves the fortune of Alexander the Great, and let none accuse us of vanity till they have heard the tale which is intended to check vanity."

As to the scheme itself—his "great basis for eternity" of Son. 125—he, in Aph. 120, alludes thus :—

"We neither dedicate nor raise a capitol or pyramid to the

pride of man, but rear a holy temple in his mind on the model of the universe, which model, therefore, we imitate. For that which is deserving of existance is deserving of knowledge—the image of existance. Now, the mean and splendid alike exist. Nay, as the finest odors are sometimes produced from putrid matter (such as musk and civet), so does valuable light and information emanate from mean and sordid instances."

In a work of his second period, he, as to Alexander and this temple, says :—

"Thou, too, art a Conqueror and Victor; but of the true sort, namely, over the Devil. Thou, too, hast built what will outlast all marble and metal, and be a wonder-bringing City of the Mind, a Temple and Seminary and Prophetic Mount whereto all kindreds of the Earth will pilgrim."

Notwithstanding the prejudice and enmity awakened against him by reason of his fall, he still, in Son. 55, says :—

"'Gainst death all-oblivious enmity
Shall you pace forth; your praise shall still find room
Even in the eyes of all posterity
That wear this world out to the ending doom.
So, till the judgment that yourself arise,
You live in this, and dwell in lovers' eyes."

In the quotation just given note the blind or cover word "you." The cover words "thee," "thy," "thou," "you," "he," "his," allude to the author himself of the Sonnets, and their right conception must ever be the first postulate in their correct interpretation. This use notably appears in the use of the word "thee" in that self-condemnatory Son. 62, which ends thus :—

"'Tis thee, myself, that for myself I praise
Painting my age with beauty of thy days."

This Sonnet should be read and noted, as it is a kind of key to the point here made. We say correct conception, for these cover words are not always so used. In the Sonnets alluding to the King, Queen, and others, the cover words, or pronouns, have their ordinary use.

For instance, we claim that the word "thou" at the beginning of Son. 88 has its ordinary use, and alludes to the King—King James—under whom Bacon was impeached. Note its word "attainted." This impeachment is likewise distinctly referred to in Son. 125, which ends thus :—

"Hence, thou suborn'd informer, a true soul
When most impeached stands least in thy control."

By the use of the mentioned cover words the author of the Sonnets preserved his manners in not directly or openly praising himself, as may be seen in Son. 3, which opens thus :—

"O, how thy worth with manners may I sing,
When thou art all the better part of me?
What can mine own praise to mine own self bring?
And what is't but mine own when I praise thee?"

We shall have to refer to this use when we reach Son. 68, and so note it here. Dante, in excusing himself for this same use, says : "In Horace man is made to speak to his own intelligence as unto another person ; and not only hath Horace done this, but herein he followeth the excellent Homer." We return, through Son. 53, to our tiring or dressing-room of the poem.

Bacon alludes to his own mental gifts as "that poor talent, or half talent, or what it is, that God hath given me." And the author of the Sonnets, in Son. 53, not only alludes to his unusual mental gifts, but to his Grecian tires, wherein he tells us he is painted new. He says :—

"What is your substance, whereof are you made,
That millions of strange shadows on you tend?
Since every one hath, every one, one shade,
And you, but one, can every shadow lend.
Describe Adonis, and the counterfeit
Is poorly imitated after you ;

On Helen's cheek all art of beauty set,
And you in Grecian tires are painted new.
Speak of the spring and foison of the year—
The one doth shadow of your beauty show,
The other as your beauty doth appear;
And you in every blessed shape we know.
In all external grace you have some part,
But you like none, none you, for constant heart."

The cover words "you" and "your" refer to the author himself of this Sonnet. We have here the "man in hue, all hues in his controlling," of that difficult Son. 20. We trust, however, that it can be opened.

Touching these Grecian tires wherein the author says he is painted new, a volume might be written, beginning with that new tiring, clothing, dressing, or swaddling of Bacon's great babe—truth—touched first in his *Hamlet*. Mr. Spedding informs us that at one time Bacon intended to bring forth his entire philosophy shadowed anew in the Greek fables. In other words, he intended to put his new wine into these old bottles, thinking thereby the more easily to introduce it. They were his wooden horse of reform, but with new occupants. He was ever framing new thought patterns from these fables, and, as stated in Son. 108, he made "antiquity for aye his page." He opens the preface to his "Wisdom of the Ancients" in these words:—

"The most ancient times (except what is preserved of them in the Scriptures) are buried in oblivion and silence. To that silence succeeded the fables of the poets; to those fables the written records which have come down to us. Thus between the hidden depths of antiquity and the days of tradition and evidence that followed there is drawn a veil, as it were, of fables, which came in and occupy the middle region that separates what has perished from what remains."

It may here be seen in what manner Shakespeare browsed on that ancient root.

We are here giving but brief touches concerning

Bacon's first literary period—his dead fleece. His second was largely an expansion and retailoring of the first. And the work of "The Grave's Tiring-room" was, we judge, but a getting together, adjusting, or arranging of the dead fleece. This golden fleece, at his fall, Bacon thought ruined; it was the broken column, but became, we judge, the pyramid, new reared, of Son. 123. This fleece consisted not merely of the Sonnets and his wood notes—the plays—which he warbled wild, together with the withheld flooring for the second period, but likewise that other side of him—the more serious side—his weavings in philosophy and creamed from a world of his other work.

In our book "The Defoe Period Unmasked," and which concerns the second period, we, at page 114, claim that the Phœnix first folio of the plays was put forth under Bacon's supervision. And see page 307. We now claim that the same was true as to the Sonnets. Why, then, it will be asked, did Francis Bacon cause that thus far impenetrable blind, that screen, that false date, that ante-date, of 1609 to stand sentinel before them? He did it, reader, that you should not know. He did it for the same reason that you yourself would have done it had you been like circumstanced. He did it for the same reason that he caused the name of others to be appended to the poems introductory to the plays, and the plays themselves to be hooded with an assumed name. He did it for the same reason that he used the blind or cover words of the Sonnets, and caused that enigma subscribed T.T. to stand in their front, of which we will some day tell you more. He did it to save the rolling of his own head from the block, as we will soon make manifest.

Again, Bacon worked ever as he conceived Providence to work. He designed to be sought and found, in his non-attributed work, only as Providence is. He

says, "The human mind is the seat of Providence." He says, "From the deepest providence of my mind." He says, "For I have taken all knowledge to be my providence." He says, "For as he is a greater politician who can make others the instruments of his will without acquainting them with his designs than he who discloses himself to those who he employs, so the wisdom of God appears more wondrous when Nature intends one thing and Providence draws out another than if the characters of Providence were stamped upon all the schemes of matter and natural motion."

This was ever Bacon's basis of work in bringing forth his vast reform, which was to be slow, silent, deep-laid, and to be telling only in its issues. His eye was ever on posterity.

He believed that entertainment was ever the first step in reform, and this whether applied to the individual or to the masses. No instruction without attention, and this, by some means, must be got. And so he framed his pen for the hovel as well as the palace. He says the sun enters into sinks and is not defiled.

Until his fall he had upheld the doctrine of passive obedience and the divine right of kings, as evidenced in both plays and Sonnets. But in those Sonnets that were written subsequent to his fall he began vigorously to retailor those doctrines upon finding the king's faithless methods with him, and so, in Son. 118, he says to the king :—

"Even so, being full of your ne'er cloying sweetness,
To bitter sauces did I frame my feeding,
And, sick of welfare, found a kind of meetness
To be diseased ere that there was true needing.
Thus policy in love, to anticipate
The ills that were not, grew to faults assured,
And brought to medicine a healthful state
Which, rank of goodness, would by ill be cured ;
But thence I learn, and find the lesson true,
Drugs poison him that so fell sick of you."

And he ends Son. 147 concerning the king thus :—

> "For I have sworn thee fair and thought thee bright,
> Who art as black as hell—as dark as night."

But do these thoughts concern a king? If the reader doubts it let him but turn to and read Son. 57 and 58.

We conclude that these Sonnets were couched at, or near, the transit of events.

With such material woven into them think you Francis Bacon would have issued them, uncovered, unmasked? A statement in print ever binds the intellect, and who, think you, knew better than he the value of an ante-date as a cover? Through his entire career, and with all the subtlety of his genius—his Providence—he had studied methods for concealment. In this he never had an equal. Of his genius Macaulay says, "With great minuteness of observation he had an amplitude of comprehension that was never yet vouchsafed to any other human being."

(*To be continued.*)

"THE MISFORTUNES OF ARTHUR."

WITH a view to studying Francis Bacon's early dramatic style, we cannot do better than glance at the first tragedy with which his name is connected. The actual play has some fine writing, though the plot is of a rather morbid character, quite in contrast to the usual Masques with which the gentlemen of Gray's Inn helped to amuse Her Majesty.

The play must have made some stir at the time, and was printed in black letter, of which only one copy has survived. This copy came into Garrick's hand, and has had various wanderings since then. Mr. Collier rescued it from oblivion, and reprinted it with a preface, along with other old plays. He remarks, "There is a richer and nobler vein of poetry running through it

than is to be found in any other previous work of the kind, and the blank verse is generally free and flowing." Though eight persons are mentioned as engaged in the production, it is more than probable that Francis Bacon did most of the writing, and strangely enough his name is printed beside that of "Nicholas Trott, Gentleman of Gray's Inn," from whom Francis was afterwards to borrow large sums, and repay still larger amounts, till he complains of usury, and the name of Nicholas Trott must have given him many a sleepless night. But here they are together devising a play for the amusement of the Court.

"The Misfortunes of Arthur"

"Certain devises and shewes presented to her Majestie by the gentlemen of Grayes Inne at her Highnesses Court in Greenwich, the 28 day of Feb. in the 30th year of her Majesties most happy reign.

At London. Printed by Robert Robinson 1587."

The names of the collaborators were: Thomas Hughes, William Fulbecke, Nicholas Trott, Francis Flower, Christopher Yelverton, Francis Bacon, John Lancaster, — Penruddock.

Mr. Hazlett says Fulbecke previously published a tragedy called *Christian Ethics*, and that Christopher Yelverton had written the epilogue to Gascoigne's *Jocasta*. These old hands were doubtless of use with their experience, but which of the eight corrected and expurged some objectionable passages we know not.

The story is taken from *Morte Arthur*, and the first pretty scene occurs when Three Muses, in classic attire, walk on the stage leading on five of the gentlemen student authors (in their usual law garments) as captives, and present them to Her Majesty the Queen. Was this Francis Bacon's first appearance? We think not.

There is a dumb show between each of the acts,

which must have been a relief from the long speeches which the bloodthirsty warriors had to recite. The female characters only appear at the beginning of the play, which arrangement would not suit our present-day audiences; but the first dumb show reminds us strangely of the opening scene of *Macbeth*, produced long afterwards.

Sounding the music there rose three *furies* from under the stage, apparelled accordingly, with snakes and flames about their black hair and garments. The first with a snake in her right hand and a cup of wine in her left; the second with a firebrand and a cupid in her left; the third with a whip in her right hand and a Pegasus in her left. Then came three nuns.

Guenevra, on hearing that her husband is returning after his long absence, cries passionately:

> "And dare he after nine years space return,
> And see her face, whom he so long disdained,
> Was I then chose and wedded for his stale,
> To look and gape for his retireless sail
> Puffed back and fluttering spread to every wind?"

She talks of suicide, and Augharet, who is the Queen's sister, soliloquises in one place upon death:—

> "Eachwhere is death! The fates have well ordained
> That each man may bereave himself of *life*,
> But none of *death*: death is so sure a doom
> A thousand ways do guide us to our graves
> Who then can ever come too late to that
> Whence, when he is come, he never can return?
> Or what avails to hasten on our ends
> And long for that which destinies have sworn!
> Look back in time: too late is to repent
> When furious rage hath once cut off the choice."

On the whole the men's speeches strike us as the

most natural in the play, and Mordred has some vigorous lines, such as—

"He that envies the valour of his foe
Detects a want of valour in himself.
He fondly* fights that fights with such a foe
Where t'were a shame to lose, no praise to win,
But with a famous foe succeed what will
To win is great renown, to lose less foil
His conquests were they more, dismay me not."

And again—

"The crown I'll keep myself, ensue what will
Death must be once, how soon I least respect.
He best provides that can beware in time
Not why, nor when, but whence, and where he falls,
What fool to live a year or twain in rest
Would lose the state and honour of a crown?"

With one more extract we have done, and it reminds us of Francis Bacon as a boy in St. James's Park looking for the echo.

"Thou echo shrill, that haunt'st the hollow hills
Leave off, that wont to snatch the latter word,
Howl on a whole discourse of our distress,
Clip off no clause; sound out a perfect sense."

Among the MS. papers of Anthony Bacon† which Thomas Birch left bound up, is a short poem which no doubt was written by an admirer of the play. In it he alludes to the first scene having a resemblance to Seneca's *Thyestis*, and also pokes fun at the numerous parents *The Misfortunes of Arthur* possessed, and wonders which of them "*so washed thy face in printer's ink*," which is a very happy expression.

*Meaning "gladly."

† British Museum, Plut. 4125.

The MS. poem runs as follows :—

" O Second Arthur bred in British brayne
Well hath myne host himself a prophet proved
For sure when first he sang thou camst again
Cassandra like his threatening few men moved
The effect expounds that oracle so dark
Forshewed this Brittish Bard's surpassing wark.

Strange was thy birth indede, and brant like
Much payns thy mother bidd with patience myld.
One noosed thee, another made thy cheeke,
And yet no doubt thou art but one man's child,
But who so washed thy face with printer's inke
Speck on the rest, I know well what I thinke !

Resigne thy buskens Sophocles the Great,
Tread Morter now with thy disarmed shanks,
For this man's braynes hath hada happier sweat,
Whereof the world commends him ample thanks.
Blush Seneca to see thy feathers loose,
Plucked from a Swan, and stickéd on a goose.

And ye swet gentlemen of Grayan name,
Well was a Solace to her Highness meant.
And all that passed from you deserves good fame,
Your mendments good, your acting excellent.
But when your spyks of Poesie be ripe,
Dance 'harvest home' after a better pipe."

A. Chambers Bunten.

THE LATEST FROM THE STATES.

"NATURE'S working up," said Whistler once. But "Amurriky" is in a fair way of beating "Nature," whose "infinite book" Shakspere studied to some advantage, according to Sir Theodore Martin and others.

A Yankee professor, Corson by name, who is "Professor of English Literature in the Cornell

University," has issued a book entitled *An Introduction to the Study of Shakespeare.* And a wonderful "study" it is to a student of English literature. He actually condescends to devote a chapter to *The Shakespeare-Bacon Controversy*, in which we are informed—"there's not a particle of evidence to begin with, of a kind even to raise the faintest suspicion, that William Shakespeare of Stratford-upon-Avon, gentleman, [a Stratford man never spelt his name that way] was not the author of the Plays and Poems attributed to him." This is good for a start, as is also this:—"Such was the creative force of the man, that all knowledge outside the range of his own experience, he used with a grand audacity." Venice, for example, was "outside of the range of his own experience, and yet he describes it like a Murray or Baedeker's guide-book. His information he obtained "by force of his imagination." [S. Lee.]

Next appears this brilliant gem:—"Learning, indeed! If Shakespeare hadn't possessed something infinitely better than learning (and, I would add, something infinitely better than a great analytic, inductive, deductive, and classifying intellect, such as that possessed by Lord Bacon) we should not now be enjoying such a noble dramatic heritage as we are. And if John Shakespeare [? Shakspere or Shagspur] had had the means to send William to Oxford or Cambridge, and William had gone through, or been driven through, the curriculum of either of these Universities, what a misfortune it might have been to mankind! He might have been schooled in, and might afterwards have adhered to, those laws of dramatic art which, in the absence of such schooling, he rendered obsolete for all time, and, by the wonderful dramatic art which he himself developed, wrought a complete revolution in the drama."

Marvellous! A University education would have spoilt Shakspere. Yet, later on, we are informed by Mr. Corson that his Shakespeare "was the best educated man that ever lived; and by 'best educated' should be understood, that his faculties, intellectual and spiritual, especially the latter, and all that enter into a personality, had the fullest, freest, and most harmonious play." And the "best educated man that ever lived" was educated (till the age of 13) at Stratford Grammar School. "Shakespeare must have felt his superiority to the *merely learned* men with whom he came in contact, and must soon have discovered that *he* drank from fountains of which they knew nothing." It was not from "fountains" that Shakspere "drank"—occasionally.

Of the First Folio Professor Corson says:—"And if *he* (Ben Jonson) had had any doubt . . . as to whether Shakespeare were the veritable author of the Plays, he was the unlikeliest man in all England to lend his name, and authority, to a work of questionable authorship." Was he? What does the Hon. D. H. Madden, the great Shakespearean, say on this point in his *Diary of Master William Silence* the perusal of which I recommend to Professor Corson:—"They (Heminge and Condell) succeeded in imposing on the simple guileless Ben Jonson, who was induced to lend the authority of his great name to their undertaking" (the First Folio). Ben Jonson played a double part by actually describing the merits of Bacon and Shakespeare in exactly identical language.

Then everybody does not think so much as Professor Corson does of "the authenticity of the First Folio," and the high standing and reputation of Heminge and Condell. The Editors of the best edition of Shakespeare —the Cambridge edition—convict Heminge and Condell of making false statements in their Preface to

the Folio, and describe them as "unscrupulous," "discredited," "knaves," and "impostors."

Professor Corson has a flying shot at the so-called "anachronisms" in Shakespeare—Bohemia made a maritime port, Julio Romano a sculptor, &c., &c., but the author knew more than his critics, as Bohemia once extended from the Baltic to the Adriatic, and Julio Romano, as is shown by the inscription on his tomb, was both a sculptor and a painter. Even if the anachronisms were anachronisms, over and over again in his works, as Lord Byron showed, Bacon perpetuated similar errors, for which "a boy at a public school would be soundly thrashed." This I showed fully in *Notes and Queries,* June 13, 1903.

Over these Shakespearean anachronisms Mr. Furness has something to say in his new *Variorum* volume of *Anthony and Cleopatra.* It is most interesting reading.

Furness quotes Hudson, who says, over the billiards "anachronism" in *Anthony and Cleopatra* :—"'An anachronism,' say the critics. But how do they know this? Late researches have shown that many things were in use in old Egypt, which, afterwards lost, have been re-invented in modern times."

Then he quotes Adee, who says :—"The human encyclopædia (Shakespeare) who wrote that sentence appears to have known—what very few people know nowadays—that the game of billiards is older thanCleopatra."

Next, *The Edinburgh Review* asserts, in reference to the mention by Shakespeare of "cannon" in *King John,* of "clock striking" in *Julius Cæsar,* and of "billiards" in *Anthony and Cleopatra* :—"No dramatic author, to produce a scenic effect, would shrink from such anachronisms, because they are not 'gross,' not so gross as to be detected in an instant by a theatrical audience, which knows nothing whatever about the origin of cannon, clocks, and billiards."

Schlegel even adopts the same argument when he maintains :—" I undertake to prove that Shakespeare's anachronisms are for the most part committed purposely and after great consideration. It was frequently of importance to him to bring the subject exhibited, from the background of time, quite near to us."

So that if these anachronisms were committed purposely, and not from ignorance, what comes of the argument that the anachronisms show that Bacon could not have written the Plays ?

In conclusion, the sapient professor is as cock-sure of everything as Macaulay or Sidney Lee when he writes : " If Shakespeare did not write the Plays attributed to him, *certainly* Lord Bacon did not write them ; " and "the credulity of those who are suffering from the dry rot of doubt is something wonderful." " Dry rot " is excellent, and almost as expressive as S. Lee's " madhouse chatter." GEORGE STRONACH.

CORRESPONDENCE

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—The short life of Fra. S. Alban, commencing *Histoire Naturelle*, referred to in BACONIANA for April, 1906, has the statement that *he travelled in Italy*. It was not safe for an Englishman then to be in Rome under his own name. If your readers study the Italian edition of " Montaigne's Travels," they will, I believe, have a reliable and exact account of our Francis' Italian tour, with most interesting details of all he saw and did in Rome, Venice, Padua, Verona, and other places. The book is edited with an infinity of notes by *Prof. Alessandro D'Ancona* [1895. littà di Castello] and is called "*L'Italia alla fine del Secolo* XVI. *Giornale del Viaggio di Michele de Montaigne in Italia nel* 1580 *e* 1581.

This was the year after Sir Nicholas Bacon died, or was put out of the way,and about the time the first Shake-speare plays came out. I believe it was under the name of *Monsieur L'Estissac* that our Francis travelled [*i.e.*, p. 1.] "Audit *Beaumont*, Mr. d'Estissac se mesla à la trope pour faire mesme voyage." A foot note

explains who this personage was: "*Figlio della signora* * *d'Estissac, alla quale é dedicato il cap* VIII. *deb lib 2nd degli Essais intitolato De l'affection des pères aux enfants.*" At the same time another foot note says [p. 4.] : "Difficile é dire chi fosse il sig. d'Estissac, ma forse é quel Carlo signore della terra di tal *nome nel Perigon, discesi di Périgueux, che morendo nel* 1586, *lascio erede la Torella Claudia maritata ad un Larochefoncauld.*"

Identification of this d'Estissac has evidently been wanting. Gregory XIII. during an audience "admonished him to study and to virtue," which proves him to have been "un giovane," of great promise and importance. Montaigne, apparently, attended him everywhere. Sincerely yours,

Naples, 1908. ALICIA AMY LEITH.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—Bodley's letter to Bacon printed in your last issue is a valuable find. It shews :—

1. That Bacon was abroad as a student of state-craft, not as an intelligencer.

2. That his funds were supplied, not by his supposed father, the rich Sir Nicholas, but by certain important "friends" who communicated through Bodley.

3. He was to make his life profitable to his country and himself more comfortable (to give satisfaction) to his "friends." He was to keep full written notes of his observations and expenditure, and if he made proper reports and accounts of his expenditure, his friends would supply him liberally with funds.

4. In 1578 Bodley was a linguist and a well-educated Englishman, aged 36, was in the service of Queen Elizabeth as her gentleman usher, necessarily a most confidential office.

5. Until about 1588 he was occasionally engaged on private confidential errands for the Queen to the Continental States. Then, settled in the Northern Provinces as Minister Resident at the Hague, he corresponded regularly with the Earl of Leicester.

6. As Bodley was not related to Bacon, the expression "My dear cousin" would only be consistent with the letter having been written on behalf of the Sovereign to a person above the rank of a baron.

This is valuable confirmation of the truth of the biliteral cipher story as to Bacon's true parentage.

PARKER WOODWARD.

Lord Palmerston and Shakspere

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—Some time ago I was asked by a doubting correspondent if I could inform him of my authority for the statement that Lord Palmerston was a disbeliever in the Shaksperean authorship of the plays.

* "*Contessa,*" in Index.

I wrote him to the following effect:—"If you will look up *Blackwood's Magazine* for November, 1865, you will find an article on Lord Palmerston in which it is stated he (Palmerston) was tolerably well up in the chief Latin and English classics; but he maintained one of the most extraordinary paradoxes touching the greatest of them that was ever broached by a man of his intellectual calibre. He maintained that the plays of Shakspeare were really written by Bacon, who passed them off under the name of an actor for fear of compromising his professional prospects and philosophic gravity. Only last year, when this subject was discussed at Broadlands, Lord Palmerston suddenly left the room, and speedily returned with a small volume of dramatic criticisms, in which the same theory (originally started by an American lady) was supported by supposed analysis of thought and expression. 'There,' he said, 'read that, and you will come over to my opinion.' When the positive testimony of Ben Jonson, in the verses prefixed to the edition of 1623, was adduced, he remarked, 'Oh, these fellows always stand up for one another, or he may have been deceived like the rest.' The argument had struck Lord Palmerston by its ingenuity, and he wanted leisure for a searching exposure of its groundlessness."

I am confident that the book referred to was the excellent work by Mr. W. H. Smith, entitled "*Bacon and Shakespeare*," 1857, a perusal of which made me a convert to the Baconian cause.

The verdict of the writer that Palmerston "wanted leisure for a searching exposure of its groundlessness" is refreshing, and has a strong resemblance to some of the more modern dicta of Mr. Sidney Lee.

Old "Pam" was not far wrong in his estimate of the Jonson statement. Mr. George Wyndham has stated that Ben was "another of the great army of literary log-rollers;" and Justice Madden has put it on record that the Editors of the First Folio, by means of their lying statements, "induced the simple, guileless Ben Jonson to lend the authority of his great name to their undertaking." Not bad this for a Shakespearean!

GEORGE STRONACH.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—As it is always interesting to see a Shakespearean commentator quoting Bacon to explain Shakespeare, I send you a copy of a note to be found in Furness' "Variorum Shakespeare," Vol. XIV., *Love's Labour Lost*, at page 151. In Act IV. scene 2, where Nathaniel (or, according to some editors, Holofernes) says:—

"Fauste, precor gelida quando pecus omne sub umbra Ruminat, and so forth. Ah, good old Mantuan! I may speak of thee as the traveller doth of Venice:

Venetia, Venetia,
Chi non ti vede non ti pretia.

Old Mantuan, old Mantuan! who understandeth thee not, loves thee not. Ut, re, sol, la, mi, fa."

This is Mr. Furness' note:—

"Knight: The pedant is in his altitudes. He has quoted Latin and Italian; and in his self-satisfaction he *sol-fas* to re-create himself and show his musical skill.—[Douce thinks that Holofernes here hums the notes of the gamut, as Edmund does in *King Lear*, I. ii. 130. The parallelism between Nathaniel and Edmund may be closer than Douce supposed. In the 'fa, sol, la, mi' of Edmund excellent musicians have detected a phrase, based upon a poignant discord, appropriate to the tragic situation. So, also, here Nathaniel's notes do not seem to have been selected haphazard. The following note has been furnished to me by my son:—'It is curious to observe that these six notes form with the tonic the most harmonious intervals, and in the same order indicated by Bacon in his *Sylva Sylvarum*:—"The *Concords* in *Musick* which are *Perfect* or *Semiperfect*, between the *Unison* and the *Diapason*, are the *Fifth*, which is the most Perfect; the *Third* next; and the *Sixth* which is more harsh: And as the Ancients esteemed, and so doe myself and some Other get the *Fourth* which they call *Diatesseron*. . . . For discords, the *Second* and the *Seventh* are of all others the most odious in Harmony to the *Sense*."—*Century* II., §107, ed. 1651. Of course Bacon is not giving his individual opinion, but stating a general law in Harmony. It is merely a curious "coincidence" that the same law appears to have been hovering in Shakespeare's mind, and that apparently there is as much meaning in his present selection of notes as there is in the selection of Edmund in *Lear*.'—H. H. F., jr.]."

The "Fa, sol, la, mi" in *King Lear* is, it will be remembered, the subject of Mr. Edwin Reed's "Coincidences."

5 Feb., 1908. G. B. Rosher.

Justice Shallow.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

Sir,—Before the insertion of my brief article under the above heading in the last number of Baconiana, I was quite unaware that the subject had been exhaustively treated by so learned a Shakesperean as Mrs. Stopes, or I should not, perhaps, have thought it necessary to trouble you with my inadequate remarks. However, I cannot but feel flattered since reading that lady's article in the *Fortnightly Review* (February, 1903), kindly brought to my notice by your able contributor and correspondent, Mr. George Stronach, to find so eminent a critic at one with myself as to the identity, or, rather, non-identity, of the ridiculous "Shallow" with the sober and honourable personality of the Knight of Charlecote. Mrs. Stopes, however, having established so completely a truth in such exact keeping with Baconian ideas is evidently (as I think) not quite easy in her mind as to the

result, and at the end of her article introduces some matter, with a view apparently of still preserving the Shakspere (of Stratford) legend, to which I should be glad to be allowed to refer. Having shown, as I have said, and conclusively, as I think, that "the introduction of the Coat of Arms (into the Shallow shield) did not refer to the Sir Thomas Lucy of Shakespeare's (Shakspere's) youth," and being apparently unconscious of the logical deduction from this, or unwilling to admit it, the accomplished dialectician suggests that the coat armour incident might have reference to a later Lucy than the Knight of Charlecote, namely, his grandson, Sir Thomas, of Sutton Park, Worcestershire. And, in order to show this, she turns to an examination of the history of the Play (*The Merry Wives*). "The acting copy" of this—that is, the copy as now universally known—she reminds us "is taken from the Folio of 1623," and (to put it shortly), if I understand her rightly, the Coat of Arms references in it do not appear in any of the Quarto copies, of which there were three editions—those of 1600 (the original), of 1602 (imperfect), and 1619 (a "pirated" edition). Well, if this be so, and I have no doubt it is, though I have not seen copies of the Quartos, this seems to me to be a very remarkable fact, and one which, I think, leads to a conclusion diametrically opposed to the one which Mrs. Stopes would establish. For is not the establishment of this fact equivalent to an admission that the coat armour passages in the Play were never in it during Shakspere of Stratford's lifetime? That, I think, is the natural conclusion, but Mrs. Stopes evidently does not think so, but suggests, as indeed is most probable, that the passages in question have reference to, and arose out of incidents in, the "Star Chamber Case," which Lucy (the grandson) "made" of the robbery of his park (Sutton) in 1610, and that it was *then* that "Shakespeare (Shakspere) may have dashed in, as a merry retort, the suggestions of the Coat of Arms which have come down to us." But, if so, why was not this "merry retort" in the edition of 1619, in which, though it was a "pirated" edition, she thinks it "more than likely that all the points that pleased the groundlings would be seized and introduced, even if heavily garbled?" Well, this was surely just such a point. How, then, I would ask again, came it to be omitted? Simply, one would suppose, as I have already suggested, because up to that time (1619, three years after Shakspere's death) the coat armour "business" had never formed part of the Play. But this apparently natural and logical conclusion would be one "too tolerable, and not to be endured" by good orthodox believers in the Stratford legend. Hence Mrs. Stopes will have none of it.

All the same I think Baconians will thank her for her suggestion that the introduction of the "luces" arose out of the great "Star Chamber Case" of Lucy *v.* Wall and Harnage and others for Park breach in 1610; and, if so, will be inclined to ask—Who so likely, that being the case, to know all about it as

Francis Bacon, then Solicitor-General, and practising in such cases? And who—if he were, as all Baconians think, the author of the original Play—so likely to make use of his knowledge for the improvement, after his fashion, of the earlier drafts, and for the "perfecting of its limbes," with a view to its inclusion in the great Folio collection of 1623, at a time when such an addition might be safely introduced without fear of offence to anybody? No one that I can think of. At all events it could hardly be the Shakspere of Stratford, for he was dead.

JOHN HUTCHINSON.

Middle Temple Library.

Bacon and Edmund Spenser

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—In BACONIANA for July, 1907, I had some remarks upon the connection between Bacon and the writings attributed to Edmund Spenser. I called attention to the first biography of Spenser which appeared, written by some unknown hand, prefixed to the third folio edition (1679) of his works.

To this biography I again direct attention, on account of a discovery made since I was formerly considering it. It has reference to the cipher story of Bacon's birth; how that he was the son of Queen Elizabeth and Leicester, born of their secret marriage, and brought up by Sir Nicholas and Lady Bacon as one of their family, indeed, as their youngest son; and how Bacon himself only came to the knowledge of his lofty parentage when he was about 16 years of age. The following passage occurs in the biography:—

"Mr. Sidney (afterward Sir Philip), then in full glory at Court, was the person to whom he (Spenser) designed the first discovery of himself; and to that purpose took an occasion to go one morning to Leicester House, furnish't only with a modest confidence, and the Ninth Canto of the First Book of the *Fairy Queen*."

The tale relates how delighted Sidney was with the reading of these stanzas and ordered his steward to pay the poet first £50, and then £100, and then £200. This is the first time this story appears in print. I had read it often before I had the curiosity to turn to the Ninth Canto of the First Book to see what like it was. I was astonished to find that almost the opening stanzas relate the birth and upbringing of Prince Arthur as almost identical with that told in the cipher story about Bacon. Here indeed was a reason—and an unexpected one—for calling the reader's attention to this Ninth Canto.

The pointed attention drawn to this Canto by the tale told in the Spenser biography is, I submit, done for a purpose. There is nothing specially beautiful in it that it should be singled out; but it was

singled out to draw attention to these "birth stanzas," as I may call them, in order that they might act as a finger-post on the road, and tell the patient searcher that he was on the right track. With the traditionary Spenser in one's mind—the poor scholar, the son of a journeyman tailor, the Irish Secretary—these stanzas suggest nothing; but with Bacon's cipher story before one, and the idea of Bacon as the author of the poem, what an illuminating flash they throw!

In the second edition of the first volume of the *Fairy Queen*, published in 1596, there are "mistakes" in paging, which I think were intended to draw attention to these stanzas by indicating the page on which they appear; but this indication was possibly found to be too cryptic to be of use, and, therefore, a more direct way was adopted in the tale I have given.

GRANVILLE C. CUNINGHAM.

NOTES

HERR DR. H. R. D. ANDERS has been taken to task by Mr. B. Frank Carpenter, the Editor of "New Shakespeareana." In his work on *Shakespeare's Books*, published in 1904 under the auspices of the German Shakespeare Society, Dr. Anders says that there are plausible or probable traces of William Shakespeare having read, in whole or in part, about three hundred authors or particular works, contemporary or classic, specifying such authors by name. Mr. Carpenter reminds Dr. Anders of this in a letter addressed to him, and calls his attention to the fact that on page 108 of his work he says, "I have not been able to discover any traces of Bacon in Shakespeare's works," to which is appended a footnote, "From the Baconians we learn how *not* to reason. This is some good, though a negative one." Mr. Carpenter in his reply proceeds to bring to the notice of Dr. Anders the report of the debate which took place in 1900 to 1903 between Dr. Appleton Morgan and Dr. Platt, especially the following clause in the protocol, which was drawn up as a result of such debate:—

There are so many thousands of identities of thought, phrase, phraseology, opinion, circumstantial statement, error and correction of error in the literatures we call respectively "Shakespeare" and "Bacon," and so many coincidences between Bacon's known doings, circumstances and studies and the material of certain of the Shakespeare plays, that it is a well-nigh successful demonstration that Bacon had more or less to do with the first folio edition of the Shakespeare plays.

Continuing, he says, "If this footnote means that you have familiarized yourself with the Baconian literature, in the course of which hundreds, perhaps thousands, of *parallellisms* between Bacon and Shakespeare are cited—*verb. lit. et punct.*, then your statement in your text means that you have found every one of these *parallelisms* specious, spurious, vicious and apparent only. If this is what you have found, sir, then you have found exactly what the reasoning and thinking world want to know and hear about. And it would be a great condescension to the Shakespeare student, who finds his studies disarranged and his preconceptions disturbed by a persistent and annoying Baconian-Authorship Theory, if you would elaborate with the weight of your authority and exact scholarship, the propositions which inferentially you italicise in your book, to wit, that there is no single trace in Shakespeare's plays of anything ever written or uttered by Francis Bacon, Lord Chancellor Bacon Verulam, Marquis St. Albans, &c., &c."

The letter proceeds to suggest that Dr. Anders should collect and frame specifications, under his propositions, or claim or thesis that there are no traces of Bacon in Shakespeare plays and poems.

To this communication Dr. Anders has replied in a letter in which he sets out the following questions :—

I. Why do Baconians accept the contemporaneous attestations with reference to the authorship of the works of Marlowe, Greene, Kyd, Jonson, Fletcher, &c., and not of Shakespeare ?

II. The protocol or concensus of the debate you quote asserts

that there are thousands of coincidences between Shakespeare and Bacon. Can the Baconians mention TEN (10) convincing coincidences where the resemblance is truly striking and cannot be due to what we call "accident?" (speaking roughly) are there not thousands of coincidences between Bacon and Jonson, between Bacon and Chapman, between Carlyle and Browning, between Schiller and Goethe? What do they prove?

III. In my work, "Shakespeare's Books" (Berlin, 1904), I have been at pains to show what books and literary productions were known to Shakespeare. Even a cursory perusal of Bacon's works would make it apparent that Bacon's library must have been of a greatly different character. But Ben Jonson's works would doubtless show many more points of agreement with Bacon's. Can it therefore be doubted that Bacon wrote Jonson's and not Shakespeare's works?

IV. Can the Baconians mention ONE clear argument which undoubtedly proves Bacon's authorship of the "so-called" Shakespearean works? Or, if they have many arguments, can they give the FIVE (or, if perhaps, the SEVEN or EIGHT) best and strongest arguments. But, for mercy's sake, let them not kill their opponents by verbosity, or imagine that "Scheinargumente" will settle the "Question." It would be advisable also if the Baconians give clear references when they quote a passage, giving chapter and verse in each case, to refer not to Baconian literature, but to the ORIGINAL works on which the Baconians are themselves dependent.

"New Shakespeareana" says, "While Dr. Anders' letter is not exactly responsive at all points, here at last is a precise challenge!" . . . "'New Shakespeareana' therefore respectfully invites the Hon. Edwin Reed, Dr. Isaac Hall Platt and Mr. Basil Brown to consent to resolve themselves into a committee which shall meet Dr. Anders' thesis as above pronounced."

There the matter stands for the present. The result will be awaited with curiosity.

* * *

In December last the *Hereford Times* reproduced the greater part of an article by the Rev. A. T. Bannister

on "Shakespeare; the Man." The writer, whilst admitting that he is "not in any technical sense a student of Shakespeare or even of English literature as a whole," treats the subject from the conventional standpoint, and endeavours to create "the man" from what, his imagination suggests, the author of the plays must have been. One sentence may be taken as a fair sample. He says, "You can easily imagine the eagerness with which the young Shakespeare, on reaching London and beginning to breathe its literary atmosphere, threw himself into the study of the Italian language and literature; how he devoured the translations which were beginning to be published; how he bought, with his earliest gains, John Florio's recently published, 'First Fruits,' the earliest example we possess of a manual of 'Italian Simplified;' how gladly, a little afterwards, he welcomed the opportunity of making the acquaintance of its author; how the fascination grew upon him of the brilliant and passionate southern life," and more of such nonsensical gush. This brought that stalwart Baconian, Mr. John Hutchinson, of the Middle Temple, writing under the pseudonym of "Ladylift," into the field, and a controversy commenced. Mr. George Stronach brought his heavy artillery to bear upon the supporters of "the man of Stratford," and left them discomforted and vanquished. The contributions of Mr. Hutchinson have already filled nine columns of the *Hereford Times*, and the discussion is still proceeding merrily. Baconians are indebted to the liberality of the editor of so widely a read paper for an opportunity of ventilating their views.

* * *

In that admirable essay, "Shakespeare-Bacon," published anonymously in 1899, there is a note on page 40 to the effect that in the records of the Accademia dei Lincei, one of the earliest modern foundations for the

study of natural science, Bacon's name is said to have been found in a list of rejected candidates for membership. Canon Lonsdale Ragg has courteously supplied the following note on the subject :—

Among the distinguished foreigners whose names were suggested (it is not stated formally proposed) for election was that of Francis Bacon, recommended by a certain Cassiano Dal Pozzo —"tragl' inglese' are the words (Breve Storia, page 26) "Cassiano Dal Pozzo raccomandò Francesco Bacone." There were, in fact, a Dutchman, a Fleming and three Germans among the very early members. There is no evidence as to whether Bacon was proposed and rejected or merely informally suggested. In either case the really significant fact is the date of Dal Pozzo's election, which was 1622, the year of Bacon's downfall.

* * *

The *Academy* is perturbed. It asks: "What has become of the Baconians? So far as we know, they have for some time forborne to shake the foundations of the literary world, and one is sorry for this silence. For, after all, there was something grandiose about the Baconian doctrine, and, since folly must always be with us, it is better that it should be on a great scale." Folly on a great scale! It is not the steady-going, persevering Baconians that display this. For a colossal display of folly, those poor, misguided creatures, who are proposing to spend £200,000 on a useless pile of bricks and mortar as a memorial of the Stratford maltster, offer the crowning example. The *Academy* makes some wise remarks on this project. "Memorials," it says, "are erected from one or more of three causes—the impulse of personal affection driving to practical expression; the need for reminding the present and future ages of the work of the man or woman celebrated; the desire to boast before foreign countries. Neither of the two first causes is operative in the case of Shakespeare. We have no personal affection for

him, not only because we never knew him personally, but because the Shakespeare of the public imagination is purely fantastic being guaranteed by no evidence whatever." The *Academy* may well inquire, "What has become of the Baconians?" It surely is not far from the kingdom of heaven, for it goes on to say, "The idea of a Shakespeare memorial is either ridiculous or offensive, or both." Before their scheme is completed, the promoters of the memorial will have a very rude awakening and the *Academy* will have an opportunity of gloating over folly on a scale which will satisfy even its insatiable appetite. One wrote in 1905: —"To those who are engaged in the business of erecting a national memorial to Bacon's idol of the theatre, William Shakespeare, I tender this unwelcome advice: they had better lose no time; the ground beneath that idol is *heavily mined.*"

* * *

For the second time the members of the Society celebrated the anniversary of Francis Bacon's birth. There was a dinner at Willis's Rooms, St. James's Street, on Wednesday, the 22nd of January. The Chair was occupied by Mr. Granville C. Cuningham, the Vice-Chair being occupied by Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence. Amongst the guests were Miss Marian Hepworth-Dixon and Mrs. Gertrude Atherton. The toasts included "The Immortal Memory of Francis Bacon" and "The Bacon Society." During the evening, ballads written from 1595 to 1626 were rendered by Madame Helen Trust and Mr. Gale Gardner, Mr. A. C. Bunten accompanying.